UNITED LODGE OF THEOSOPHISTS
BANGALORE CITY.
LIBRARY COPY

THE ARYAN PATH

Point out the "Way"—however dimly, and lost among the host—as does the evening star to those who tread their path in darkness.
—The Voice of the Silence

VOL. XVIII AUGUST 1947 No. 8

GREAT IDEAS

[Comparatively speaking, Ben Jonson is appreciated only in a restricted way by the idealist and the mystic. This is perhaps due to the fact that his *Discoveries—Timber or Discoveries made Upon Men and Matters* is very little read. In compiling this book of aphorisms he not only used his own observation and imagination but also used thoughts adopted and adapted when his mind was tranquil and his mood concentrated and receptive to great thoughts. Ben Jonson died on 6th August 1637 and so this month may well be appropriated to reflect upon a few selected aphorisms from that volume.—ED.]

Wisdom without honesty is mere craft and cozenage.

I am glad when I see any man avoid the infamy of a vice; but to shun the vice itself were better.

If we would consider what our affairs are indeed, not what they are called, we should find more evils belonging to us, than happen to us.

There are many that, with more ease, will find fault with what is spoken foolishly, than can give allowance to that wherein you are wise silently.

The worst opinion gotten for doing well should delight us.

Ill fortune never crushed that man whom good fortune deceived not.

He knows not his own strength, that hath not met adversity.

No man is so foolish, but may give another good counsel sometimes; and no man is so wise, but may easily err, if he will take no other's counsel but his own.

The order of God's creatures in themselves is not only admirable and glorious, but eloquent: then he who could apprehend the consequence of things in their truth, and utter his apprehensions as truly, were the best writer or speaker.

I have considered our whole life is like a play: wherein every man, forgetful of himself, is in travail with expression of another.

I have discovered that a feigned familiarity in great ones, is a note of certain usurpation on the less.

THE PATH OF NON-VIOLENCE

[Almost at the same time we received two articles on the subject of Gandhiji's Satyagraha : they are independently written and present two distinct view-points.

The first is written by **Shri G. R. Malkani**, the Director of the Indian Institute of Philosophy at Amalner, a clear thinker with whose work our readers are familiar.

The second is by **Shri N. B. Parulekar,** who has done useful, practical work in the cause of peace and whom we welcome as a new contributor. He is the author of *Let Us Win the Peace* and is an active and enthusiastic worker of " The Bombay Peace Brigade. "

We present these two points of view which need to be reflected upon more than discussed.—ED.]

I.—THE LIMITATIONS OF NON-VIOLENCE

We in India are on the eve of independence. But we cannot retain this independence if certain false notions persist in the minds of the leaders of political thought. The Indian National Congress is largely dominated by Mahatma Gandhi ; and Mahatma Gandhi has made of *ahimsā* or non-violence not only the highest kind of religion, but also a political principle of the greatest efficiency. It appears to us that it is nothing of the sort, and that this exaltation of the principle of non-violence involves some confusion of thought, in respect of both religion and politics.

We can understand that a person may be so mentally elevated that he regards no one as his enemy. He has, so to say, effaced his own individuality. The world is to him kith and kin. If any one is hostile to him, he shows love to him as to an erring brother. Love has great potency, and can subdue the wild animal, not to speak of human beings. But human love is necessarily limited and finite. It cannot achieve everything. It is only a theoretical belief that if love is infinite or sufficiently strong, nothing can stand in its way. In actual practice, it can achieve only limited results.

All that we can say is that, given proper material, it can often do wonders. It can disarm a bitter enemy and win him over. If we can show an enemy that we are never offended no matter what he does to us, he is soon tired of doing any injury to us and surrenders to our love. But, once again, we emphasise the phrase " given proper material. " If the enemy employs only harassing tactics, there is at least time in our favour. Our continued suffering without protest or thought of retaliation may impress him, and he may soon desist from his persecution and even reciprocate our feelings. Such

conciliation can be permanent and lasting as no other conciliation can be. Ill-will is replaced by good-will.

Again, we have to assume that the enemy is not lost to all considerations of humanity, and that his religion does not make him think that the pain and the suffering of the Kafir are of no account whatsoever and that he is obeying the behests of his religion when he kills the Kafir. Religious fanaticism is the worst type of fanaticism. You can never argue with a religious fanatic or impress him in any way. Granting, however, that there is no man but is a human being at heart and that even a granite heart could be impressed, nothing whatsoever can be done to a fanatic through love if he is out, not for harassing tactics, but for outright destruction and the imposition of his will. If he has closed his mind to argument and works on the single motto of "Sword or Koran!" he allows us absolutely no time to win him through our suffering. He would give hell to any one who raised his voice in protest or made any gesture of opposition.

It has sometimes occurred to us, in all humility, whether even Mahatma Gandhi, the prophet of *ahimsā*, could show any result in such a situation. There have been several occasions when he could have put his philosophy to the test, but unfortunately (or, as I should think, fortunately), he has not availed himself of them. When the Hurs of Sind were being suppressed, he protested against the employment of violence against them. But the world would indeed have been convinced most definitely about the efficacy of this weapon, if his non-violence could have succeeded where violence did not. Similarly in the case of mob-fury in some of the worst riots of recent times, we have had no ocular proof, and we think that none is possible. Where Mahatma Gandhi has succeeded, the material was relatively good.

We shall now take a different line of argument, also suggested by Mahatma Gandhi. This argument takes the form of the question, What if you fail? You may get killed, but you will have served a great cause. We brush aside the question, which is quite pertinent here, whether any of us want to get killed in this way. But what cause should we have served by getting killed in meek or non-violent protest? We have in the above circumstances no opportunity of prolonged suffering through which we could so much as start satyagraha. Whether we were true satyagrahis or not would not be known even to ourselves. Our satyagraha would not make any news. The proper word for it would be "slaughter." There is no scope for satyagraha where reason on the other side is lacking and where there is a pure and unadulterated exhibition of naked force. We might console ourselves that we at least would have died bravely and with no enmity in our heart, and that the advertisement of newspapers is a modern evil which is best avoided.

But let us not delude ourselves with the idea that this kind of satyagraha has any kind of efficacy; and by efficacy we mean "power to touch the heart of the enemy and make him relent." There are occasions where force can produce an understanding which nothing else can.

In the present case, we shall have died without proving the social value of satyagraha. We shall have served no social cause. We shall at best have sacrificed ourselves in the fires of fanaticism in order to give ourselves the spiritual consolation of saying: "What if we die! Is life worth living without love and non-violence?" But then let us not speak of non-violence as a social or a political weapon. It is at best a spiritual weapon in the hands of a holy person who cares not for the goods of life, and who is content to depart when his religion demands it. It is expecting too much of normal social beings with social responsibilities and when the honour of womenfolk is at stake, to demand that they should behave like such a holy person, or that any amount of preaching can make them love their enemies and entertain no bitterness in their hearts in the face of the worst kind of atrocities. Non-violence is a *religious ideal for the individual;* it is not a *social or political weapon.* We deceive ourselves, if we think otherwise.

But is non-violence even the highest form of religion? It is not so unconditionally. Hinduism is not a religion of non-violence, nor is Islam. Non-violence has been specially preached by Buddhism, Jainism and Christianity. But the Christian and the Buddhistic nations have observed it only in the breach. No nation could live with non-violence as its only weapon. A nation is not made of men with no real interests in the world. It has to meet active violence from other nations, and it cannot effectively meet it without active preparation to meet violence with violence. This violence on the political plane is quite consistent with the highest form of spiritual life and thought.

In the *Gita,* Arjuna gives the very arguments which an ardent satyagrahi would give: "They are my kith and kin, my elders and gurus for whom I have respect—how can I kill them? What shall I do with all this worldly greatness by killing those very persons who are dear and near to me?" etc. But Sri Krishna called all this talk cowardly and unmanly. The duty of a Kshatriya is to fight for a righteous cause, unmindful of the result.

Violence can be a duty; and it is quite consistent with the highest form of spiritual insight. Does not Sri Krishna say that the real spirit, the *ātman,* can never be killed, and that nobody ever kills or is killed? Knowing all that, on the plane of action, we cannot get away from our duty however irksome or unpleasant it may be. We have to do our duty without any desire for the fruit, simply because it is a duty. Sri Krishna goes even so far as to say

that he had already killed all those people who were arrayed on the other side, and that if Arjuna thought that *he* could do anything he was really mistaken. All things that are ever done are done by the will of God. He is the only real actor if there is one. We mistakenly take the credit and the discredit to ourselves.

If we rise to that level, violence does not appear so heinous a thing. God attains His ends in various ways. We are only His instruments. We do not see far. We see only our duty. This we must do in the spirit of dedication to the cause of righteousness, and not by way of self-aggrandisement. If the integrity of society requires violence, let there be violence. Where persuasion would do and violence is unnecessary, let there be persuasion. But let us not make a religion of non-violence. It is only a one-sided religion. The higher religion is that which does not preach resort to violence, but which is not afraid of violence where it alone is indicated in the strange and variegated forms of human idiosyncrasies and human relationships.

G. R. MALKANI

II.—MODERN DILEMMAS

Every human being is longing first for peace, and secondly for freedom from want of the necessities of a care-free life, and also from harm and unjustifiable interference. To make such conditions possible, a universal peace, which can come only from the establishment of the brotherhood of man, is the recognised prerequisite. How such an ideal world can be brought about is the question that has been vexing the minds of all thinking men. The means to attain this ideal that are being suggested, after mature consideration, by practical philosophers differ fundamentally from those that easily appeal to most persons. Over what the right means are, wordy wars are being waged. The greatest difficulty appears to be how to change the structure of society and the relations between nations—governments—as that is the first step without which no progress towards the above ideal would be possible.

We are meanwhile facing at every stage of our so-called advance more difficult dilemmas and we are baffled as to how to solve them. No sooner do we think that we have at last found a means to get out of one, than another more monstrous one crops up. Our dilemmas have eaten up almost all our energy and capacity which would otherwise have helped us to promote our well-being and happiness. But most of us do not yet appear to be prepared to take half as much trouble to go to the source from which this unbroken chain of dilemmas springs.

The attitude of most of us is not far different from that described by

Tolstoy in his historical story. For celebrating his coronation, King Nicolas II announced the free distribution of sweets and drinks to the poor. People rushed from all parts of the country to take advantage of it. Everyone tried to reach the place of distribution in advance of the other that he might not miss his share. Many were trampled to death in the *mêlée* that ensued. Those who survived began accusing, not themselves for their foolishness or madness, but some the King for announcing that kind of a celebration, others, the management and still others, the police for failing to maintain order!

Such occurrences are common. Even after bitter consequences, we refuse to see the wrong basis of our conduct and beliefs and fail to reform them because we cling to our old habits and take them to be the only practical ones.

If we reflect, it will occur to us that almost all our modern dilemmas spring from the wrong basis of our conduct, our attitude of violence. The great thinkers have pointed this out to us. We have also lately begun to pay lip sympathy or, better to say, lip approval to it. At least since the end of the first great world war, most of us have begun to clamour for disarmament, but how to bring it about has remained a dilemma. We are practically unanimous in our demand that future wars must be prevented and that a powerful International Authority must come into existence to settle disputes between the Nations. But we do not yet see any clear signs of the emergence of such an authority or of the atmosphere guaranteeing security against any future war. To solve this dilemma the best brains are still fully absorbed without any promise of success.

If we but care to find the real root cause of this vexing situation we will not fail to trace it to the wrong basis of our conduct and beliefs. It must dawn upon us that we have deliberately ignored the simple and obvious basis of human conduct revealed to us by the seers and prophets and that if we but faithfully follow it and persuade our fellow-beings to do the same, these dilemmas can be prevented at the source. This is no other than "non-violence" in thought, word and deed. But for centuries we have believed that the way of non-violence is all right for saints but is not practical for worldly people.

Gandhiji reintroduced the doctrine as the basis of human conduct. He has experimented and developed it on a very wide scale for the last nearly fifty years and demonstrated its boundless potentialities in all fields of human activity. Still the hypnotisation of many of us by our long-formed beliefs has been so thorough that up to this moment the practicability and the efficacy of non-violence are being questioned from different points of view even by some highly learned persons. Some others who dare not challenge the doctrine outright, in view of the concrete results achieved by Gandhi-

ji's grand-scale experiment, would yet describe its limitations.

"Indeed it is difficult to see," they argue, "how a person can practise absolute non-violence except in an ideal world. We only want to emphasise that non-violence and universal love can be an ideal only with the Sanyasi. Even Yogis and Sanyasis fall far short of the ideal, for a being with the sense of having a body to feed and maintain in health will not be able to be always fully non-violent. The very processes of growth imply violence or destruction or death of some living thing or other. A healthy body implies the ability to kill inimical germs. Even at a generous estimate seventy-five per cent. of mankind are at heart predominantly Tamasic and Rajasic. Greed, anger, lust and violence are the warp and woof of their being. Therefore the Tamasic and Rajasic forces have to be effectively neutralised by counter Tamasic and Rajasic forces, if what is valuable in civilisation is to be saved. The use of violence in maintaining a righteous cause is a virtue."

If these arguments are taken to be the unchallengeable last word in the code governing human conduct, then mankind cannot hope to escape the formidable dilemmas that are every day confronting it and the ideal world will ever remain a day-dream.

First, therefore, we must, once for all, come to an irrevocable decision as to whether it is at all within the power of man to bring an ideal society into existence. Or whether, because we are after all imperfect human beings, we are destined to remain for ever imperfect and all our struggles towards perfection, if we make any, are going to prove to be nothing better than running after a mirage. If thinking persons come to a unanimous conclusion on this point, one way or the other, it will then be easy to decide upon the goal to be pursued and the means for achieving it.

It can safely be assumed that thinking persons in general will not be prepared to admit that it is absolutely beyond the power of man to bring about the ideal world, or the ideal society. But most of them cannot give up the idea of the means to which they have long been accustomed, and when new means are suggested they are prompted to rule them out as impracticable. They are keen to attain the goal of an ideal world, but how they fail to understand that such an attempt as theirs is like boarding a train bound for Madras and yet hoping to reach Delhi, I, for one, cannot imagine!

It is recognised human psychology that a revolution in public belief takes place very slowly at first, just as an empty pot lowered into a well takes in water very slowly in the beginning but, when it becomes sufficiently heavy with the water already taken in, it gets filled in no time. The fact that more and more people have begun seriously to think about the potentiality of non-vio-

lence is an indication that non-violence is sure shortly to become a universally accepted creed.

Let us now critically examine the arguments against non-violence that are being even now advanced, including those quoted above. Can we expect an ideal society or an ideal world to fall from heaven? In other words, must an ideal world first come into existence for a man to be able to lead an ideal life? Or is it only an increasing number of men leading ideal lives that is going to convert the existing world into an ideal one? It has been proved beyond the shadow of a doubt, by ample historical evidence and also logically, that counter-violence has not succeeded and will never succeed in neutralising violence. The last war, like previous wars, was fought to end all wars, but has produced the atom bomb, creating one more dilemma—how to control it?

Who is to decide, and how, what a righteous cause is? And, once you use violence for the so-called righteous cause, who can prevent you, and how, from using it for other than a righteous cause? If you try to answer these questions, the fallacy of these arguments will be self-evident.

As far as present governments are concerned, they are machineries of violence, supposed to derive their power to use violence from the lawful consent of the ruled. This is inevitable so long as society is violence-minded. To prevent or check violence in society, governmental violence is considered to be the lesser evil. But it is after all an evil and universally admitted to be such. It is also universally admitted that, because of the existence of this evil in our midst, the greater, all-destructive evils, wars, spring up as its inevitable climaxes.

We must not forget this. We must also not forget that mankind is unanimous in denouncing wars and is anxious to remove all possibilities of their recurrence. If wars are considered unavoidable evils and regular features of human life, then matters will stand on an altogether different footing. But are we going to consider the law of the sword the final deciding factor in any dispute? If so, then, as is admitted, the natural outcome will always be that those who are better armed will win; "the stronger will always get the best of the affair, and the weaker will have often to go to the wall irrespective of the justice of their cause," and might will establish itself as right. Will the "righteous cause" have any meaning under those circumstances? Whatever one considers to be one's rights, if one is able through the use of force to get them, will have to be accepted as a righteous cause!

It is being claimed that violence has all along held sway; that the moral basis of non-violence has always broken down in this imperfect world; that non-violence has to be preserved at the point of the bayonet; that Christ's insistence on non-violence, love and peace have not

found many followers in Christian lands ; that, although Islam is said to be a religion of peace, it is doubtful if the adherents of any other religion have been addicted to such unrestricted violence ; that precept and practice have seldom kept pace with each other and that even Buddha, Christ and Chaitanya have been able to influence their enemies but slightly. These and countless other such claims that are being made are worthless as evidence that mankind is incapable of pursuing the path to perfection. They only prove, if anything, that men in general have chosen to commit a continuous default by failing to abide by the law of their own being. It is no wonder therefore that they are undergoing the punishment for that breach.

To prove the impracticability of non-violence either for common people in their worldly affairs or in some fields of group life, such as economics or politics, the authority of the Vedanta and the *Gita* even is sought, in the belief that it would be held to be unimpeachable. As the doctrine of non-violence has its origin in the religious injunctions, how can such an authority be had ? The fun of the matter, however, is that these critics of " non-violence " have no alternative to so misinterpreting the teachings as to suit their own meaning. The following quotations are given :—

The soul is never born, nor does it die. It is eternal and is not killed. Weapons do not destroy it. Any work or occupation suited to one's nature, whether it involves violence or not, will be a means to freedom, if it is done in a non-attached spirit. He who does the duty ordained by his own nature incurs no evil provided he develops non-attachment.

What a gross misinterpretation it is to say that these quotations permit violence ! These and similar arguments are in the nature of the Devil's quoting scripture to defend his actions. One will not fail to notice in these quotations that the most essential condition, in which no blame can be attributed to a person resorting to violence, is that the performance must be " in a non-attached spirit. " To detach from the context this prerequisite condition of reaching a state of non-attachment and to tell a man of passions that there is scriptural authority for him to practise violence, is an utter distortion of the scriptures. When a man reaches a state of non-attachment, his actions are not prompted by any feeling of enmity, hatred, revenge or violence and he incurs no sin for what he does because he does not remain conscious that he himself is the doer. The state of non-attachment and non-violence are practically synonymous. The realisation of the soul as being eternal, not subject to birth or death and immune from destruction by weapons, is the highest state of human perfection which it is the only mission of human life to reach. By mere theoretical knowledge of it, can we kill a person

and yet hope to escape the sin ? Let us see what the *Gita* actually has said :—

> Hold alike pleasure and pain, gain and loss, victory and defeat, and gird up thy loins for the fight ; so doing thou shalt not incur sin.
>
> He who is free from all sense of "I," whose motive is untainted, slays not nor is bound, even though he slay all these worlds.

As the critics of non-violence acknowledge the authority of the above scriptural statements, they obviously believe man capable of the effort to reach such perfection. How is it then that they deny his capacity to act non-violently ?

Is there any necessity for advocating violence ? Is that not a brute instinct easily exhibited by man ? Are we to perpetuate our imperfection by making provision for it ? Man does not possess the power to give life to the dead. What authority has he, therefore, to put a person to death ? Again, "Man is not capable of knowing the Absolute Truth and therefore is not competent to punish." We often revise our opinions. How can we say with certainty what is absolutely justifiable and how can we use violence for its achievement ?

The whole trouble with the critics of non-violence is that without any serious effort to remove the deep-rooted beliefs from the minds of the mass of average men, they expect immediate and solid results from the superficial influence Gandhiji's non-violence movement has exerted on the mass mind. Are not the results visible even from the superficial observance of non-violence, and that too by a comparatively small number of persons out of the vast population of India, enough to indicate to any unbiased observer the boundless potentialities of the practice ?

If by beating a drum we are able to prepare lakhs of men to commit slaughter, why should we consider it impossible to prepare an equal number to practise non-violence, which guarantees well-being and peace to all ? Is it difficult to convince the people that whatever good one does to another without selfish motive never goes in vain ? Can we not impress upon them that whatever thoughts they send out return to them with redoubled force; that when they wish well to others, even to their enemies, the thought-forces of wishing well invariably return to them ; that the sword of forgiveness is "the soft heart-piercing non-metallic weapon" and is proof against evil ; and that we must not do to others what we wish others should not do to us ?

Even for impressing people with the utility of a product, continuous advertisement and practical demonstration are required. Similarly, enough and continuous preaching and practice of non-violence are necessary if ever larger numbers of people are to be made to understand its value and to take to it. It is the only effort worth making. For centuries we have glorified the bravery of the sword, individual competition

and the accumulation of riches, all three of which are in effect the negation of regard for our fellow-beings. If we are really honest in our intention to solve our present dilemmas, to prevent future wars, to bring about the universal brotherhood of man and an ideal world in which all mankind can live in harmony and happiness, is it not incumbent on all right-thinking persons all over the world to join together for propaganda for making the people non-violence-minded, by glorifying acts of utmost regard for one's fellow-being, of love even of one's enemy and of the bravery of selfless sacrifice for the good of others? This change in the basis of human conduct is in turn the basis for changing the existing structure of society and also the existing relations between nations.

When we keep before our eyes the highest ideal and mankind is persuaded to try to reach it, all will succeed at least in approaching much nearer to it. That is how unity will automatically be brought about. Tolstoy has said that it is not necessary for one man to run after another to bring about unity; let everyone move towards the light and all will come together.

When violence is thus removed from society, the governments which are today institutions of organised violence will no longer be necessary and society can reach an ideal state of anarchy—not in the sense of chaos, but in the sense that without the help of any government men can manage their affairs harmoniously. In the intervening stage the reign of non-violence will facilitate the coming into existence of an International Authority. Let all our intellect, energy and efforts be directed towards making world-wide propaganda for non-violence as the only worthy basis of human conduct; and all the evils from which society is suffering today will vanish.

N. B. PARULEKAR

MALAVIYAJI

We are glad to learn that a Committee has been set up for the purpose of publishing an authentic biography of Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, the illustrious founder of the Benares Hindu University and one of the makers of modern India; for his life, crowded as it was with acts of selfless service to the country, will be an abiding inspiration to the people. The Committee, of which Professor Trilochan Pant of the Benares Hindu University is the Secretary, has requested, therefore, all those institutions, associations and organisations with which Panditji was connected and those individuals who knew him intimately, as well as the editors of the periodicals and papers in which articles on him appeared, to co-operate with it in its project by sending all the available pertinent biographical material to the Secretary.

WHAT RELIGION SHOULD WE TEACH OUR CHILDREN ?

[**Miss Margaret Barr**, whose book *The Great Unity* has recently gone into the second edition, writes here on her favourite theme, so important for all who aspire to build a better world. The unity of knowledge is a fundamental and no branch thereof can be neglected in our educational curricula without peril to the whole. The Knowledge of religion as a Science, in both the theoretical and the applied sections, should be imparted and the development of the subject should follow treatment similar to the one given to any other subject. If the Hindus of today had known the beauties of Islam and its influence in the social sphere, the cry of Pakistan perhaps would never have been heard. Equally true is it that the ignorance of Muslims, not only the illiterate but also the educated, about Hindu religion and philosophy has narrowed their views, tarnished their patriotism and deflected their loyalty to sectarian channels. In the future India, as in Pakistan, the problem of religious education for the young should occupy the prompt and careful attention of the legislatures.—ED.]

The question of religious instruction for children is always before the public mind, and it would seem that the majority who have any views on the subject incline to one of two camps.

On the one hand are the secularists who feel that the harm done by religion throughout history so far outweighs the good, that the best thing would be for us to wash our hands of it completely and by leaving children entirely without religious instruction, leave them free either to live out their lives untouched by religion or to evolve a faith for themselves when they reach the age to do so.

On the other hand are those who believe that their primary duty in life is to proselytise for the faith to which they happen to belong and who consequently make the most of every opportunity that comes their way for influencing the unformed and pliable minds of children and young people.

If a tree is to be judged by its fruits (and how else can it be judged ?) it would appear that both of these attitudes are tragically wrong. For surely the absence of any religion is one of the root causes of the materialism, selfishness and restlessness which prevail throughout the world at the present day. Whereas communal conflict, intolerance and bigotry are some of the fruits of the dogmatic, proselytising attitude.

Let us look a little more closely at both of these. The secularist argument is plausible and cogent. It is difficult to deny that religion has been either the cause or the pretext of many black chapters in human history and will continue to

be a very dangerous rallying-cry so long as the masses remain either ignorant and superstitious or bigoted and fanatical. Therefore, say the secularists, let us be rid of it once and for all; and if, as the religious people claim, religion has any intrinsic value or importance, it will rise again from the ashes of the old faiths in the hearts and minds of people who have been left free and unprejudiced in childhood.

Such a theory rests on the assumption that religion is in a class by itself and differs radically from all other activities of the human mind. And it is in conflict with educational theory in all other branches of knowledge. We do not say that, if Mathematics and Science have any intrinsic value, people will discover them for themselves in adult life without any teaching when young. Doubtless, in the future as in the past, if these subjects were left untaught, an occasional rare mind, a Euclid, a Galileo, a Newton, would arise to make the discoveries all over again. But because the average human being is not a gifted creature like these, does that mean that Mathematics and Science have no value for him? How much of the knowledge which is put to daily use in the healing of the sick by the average practitioner would ever have been acquired by him without guidance and teaching and the knowledge of the findings of his predecessors? And even in the less specifically rational and more imaginative activities, such as Art and Music, surely it is only the very greatest who can achieve anything without instruction and in utter independence of all that has gone before, if indeed anybody ever can.

And in religion also, though it is true that saints and mystics cannot be made by teaching any more than musicians and artists can, it is also true that the lives of ordinary, average people can be enriched and ennobled by contact with religious genius just in the same way as by contact with the world's great works of art and music and literature. It would seem, therefore, that the secularists are insisting upon an unwarranted impoverishment of the educational environment when they press for complete secularisation.

The people in the other camp, on the contrary, believing that religion is the most important thing in life, leave no stone unturned in their endeavour to persuade or compel everyone to join their particular organisation and profess their creed. By them also, though in a different way, the accepted canons of educational theory are discarded. In all other subjects it is the aim of education to teach children to think for themselves and to understand the things that they study, tracing the development of a subject step by step. But in religion what matters is the acceptance of truths miraculously revealed in a book which under no circumstances is to be submitted to the ordinary processes of rational criticism but is to be venerated blindly as being

entirely different from all other books, the *ipsissima verba* of God.

Surely it is possible to find a middle path between these two extremes, one that shall neither disregard nor contradict the findings of enlightened educational theory.

The secularists are right in demanding that children's minds be left free and unprejudiced. But is it not possible to give them an introduction to the study of religion, as to Natural Science and Geography, without either fettering their minds or filling them with prejudices?

The other camp is right in asserting the tremendous importance of religion and the harm that is done by leaving it out of a child's education. But that does not mean that religion should be presented to the child mind as something wholly different from all the other things he learns, something which he must just accept blindly and on no account question or seek to understand.

It is true, of course, that no amount of teaching can give religious experience to either child or adult, any more than it can create a poet, an artist or a musician. But it is also true that even the least gifted can derive great inspiration from the achievements and example of the great. It is also true that children are by nature hero-worshippers and, if encouraged in their early years, can grow up to revere those who are great in spirit above those who are merely great in martial prowess—the warriors and conquerors of history's sorry tale. And people taught to know and love, not one only but all of the world's great spiritual leaders, will have a far better foundation on which to build their own religious life than those brought up in either the secularists' or the dogmatists' camp.

It would seem, therefore, that in approaching the question of religious instruction for children, certain basic principles should be kept in mind:—

First, that the capacity for clear, honest thinking is one of man's greatest and rarest capacities and that, no matter what the subject of their study, children should be encouraged to develop this capacity to the utmost and to be as honest in their doubts and questionings as in their beliefs and acceptances. Such honesty will not lead them astray but will help them to sift the gold from the dross and to distinguish between superstition and faith.

Second, that, great though thought is ("the light of the world and the chief glory of man" as Bertrand Russell has called it) it is not man's only gift, and in the study of religion, as of other subjects, imagination, idealism and reverence should also be allowed full play. Encourage children, by all means, to think and reason and ask questions about the tenets and teachings that have come down from past ages, but let them be encouraged also to love and revere the great souls who have set examples of unselfishness and tolerance and devotion and courage, of love for God and their fellows. For it is only such love and reverence that can

awaken in them the desire to explore for themselves the path which those great ones trod and to test for themselves the truth of their religious message.

What then is the answer to our question, " What religion shall we teach our children ? " Far be it from the present writer to attempt any final or dogmatic answer. And before attempting even a tentative one, let me first reiterate and stress some negative points that must never be lost sight of.

First, that we should not confine our teaching to any one of the religious and theological systems of the world. Second, that when teaching children we should avoid everything controversial. And, third, that the teacher should remember always that, strictly speaking, he cannot teach religion at all; that what he is will always speak more loudly than what he says and that the utmost he can hope to do is, by his own example and by the inspiration which he can put into his teaching, to make his pupils want to embark upon the quest for themselves.

Having made these points clear, the writer's own answer as to what the content of the teaching should be can be summarised very shortly :—

For young children, suitable stories, both scriptural and traditional, from all the world's religions.

At the next stage, outlines of the lives and teachings of the founders of the living religions, and perhaps even of the founders of some religions no longer living, such as Akhnaton of Egypt.

At the next stage, studies of outstanding passages in the world's sacred books.

Trees (and religions) must be judged by their fruits and, since no one of the world's faiths can claim a monopoly of good fruits, children should be taught the facts about them all, in order that they may grow up free from the bigotry and superiority complex that cripple the minds of those whose early instruction is narrow and dogmatic.

In other words, they should be taught, not just this or that particular religion, but the perennial, universal truths which are at the root of all. And since it is useless to expect that teaching such as this will be given in the home, it would seem that all religious instruction given in schools should be along these lines. *So long as school instruction also remains in the hands of people whose chief concern is to proselytise for one particular faith, just so long will children continue to grow up either with narrow, exclusive notions about religion or with no interest in it at all, as at present.*

It is unfortunately true that at the moment there are almost as few teachers as parents with the necessary interest and knowledge to teach in this way, but that is a fault that can fairly quickly be remedied if the matter is taken in hand by training centres and colleges and insisted upon in all State and State-aided schools. We teach citizenship as a

matter of course these days, but who can be said to have had an adequate course in that subject if he has been brought up in ignorance of or with distorted ideas about the religion and customs of his fellow-citizens? When the State takes the matter up and insists on teaching religion as impartially and thoroughly as it teaches other subjects, there will at last be some hope of doing away with the rivalry and bitterness and misunderstanding that at present rend India in pieces and cast such a dark cloud over a future otherwise bright with hope and promise.

MARGARET BARR

WORKERS AND WORK

There are echoes of William Morris in Shri J. C. Kumarappa's monograph "The Philosophy of Work," recently published under that title with two other valuable essays by the All-India Village Industries Association at Wardha. But there is also an important contribution of the writer's own. Morris's was a cry in the wilderness of complacent nineteenth-century industrialism. Since his appeal, catastrophe has twice overspread the world. Industrialism is less complacent today. Has suffering made it also more receptive?

Shri Kumarappa pleads for the recognition that the well-being of the worker is the proper end of work. Culture should be a natural unfoldment through work, not something imposed from without. Work should develop the worker's intelligence, his character and his artistic sense. He must be able to see the social aspect of his contribution.

The creative element—"the germ of growth"—and toil are harmoniously blended in work of the right type, as are the constituent parts of a balanced diet. They are both essential. The selfish attempt to split work into its constituent elements, to take the pleasure for oneself and to impose the toil on others leads to slavery—whether the chattel-slavery of ancient Greece and Rome or the wage-slavery of modern days. It turns, he says, the routine part of work to drudgery and makes of its play part, indulgence. And it leads inevitably to the concentration of power, with all its evils.

Division of labour up to a certain point, Shri Kumarappa concedes, is in the interest of efficiency but it becomes unwholesome when carried beyond the point where a man's work allows no intelligent interest, no scope for his initiative.

Shri Kumarappa declares that human progress is being checked by industrialisation and standardisation. By ignoring the fact that the providing of material needs is not the sole or even the highest end of work,

> we may be gaining the whole material world but we are undoubtedly losing our soul. Is it not time we called a halt and took stock and adjusted our mode of living and working to cultivate that which is highest and noblest in us?

PROSELYTISM IN FREE INDIA

[For years Gandhiji has been pointing to the fundamental weakness in the proselytising religion whose missionaries have reaped in India a harvest so disproportionate to the great efforts made. To him the sole criterion, he said, was whether the missionaries were spreading "the perfume of their lives." If they had spiritual truth, it would transmit itself, as the rose transmitted its own scent, without a movement. "All I want them to do is to live Christian lives, not to annotate them." The denationalising effect of conversion to Christianity, which he has pointed out and which **Mr. Anthony Elenjimittam** brings out here, carries in it the seeds of the destruction of official Christianity as a power in India, seeds which, as Mr. Elenjimittam makes plain in this article, will inevitably bear their fruit when India is free. That which the world needs is a change of heart and not a change of label. In all religions there is underlying truth as also superficial falsehood or superstition. The wise man is he who accepts the common truth they hold and rejects the unique claims and private fallacies of all.—ED.]

In 1932 the Report of the American Laymen's Foreign Mission Inquiry was published—*Re-thinking Missions*. The Report is worth studying, because it is the most liberal and universal approach to Christianity *vis-à-vis* the historical non-Christian religions. There is not the slightest trace of clerical bigotry or ecclesiastical obscurantism in it. It is a Laymen's Report, an American Report, and hence free, positive and realistic.

The aim of missionary enterprise, the Report says, "is to seek with the people of other lands a true knowledge and love of God, expressing in life and word what we have learnt through Jesus Christ, and endeavouring to give effect to His spirit in the life of the world." The missionaries are advised not to try for the impossible, *viz.*, the uprooting of other religions, but to seek "continued co-existence with Christianity" of all other religions, "each stimulating the other in growth towards the ultimate goal—unity in the completest religious truth." The Report further proclaims that all men are seekers after truth and that all religions, including Christianity, have much to learn from the others. The Report adds :—

> All fences and private properties in truth are futile; the final truth, whatever it may be, is *the New Testament of every existing faith.*

The Report is remarkable for its breadth of vision, its insight into religious truths, and, above all, for its all-embracing sympathy and really catholic outlook.

The Report attracted but a few thinking minds. Practically it fell flat, became a voice in the wilderness,

in the midst of the overwhelming majority of the official Christian churches who are enticing the poor and ignorant of this land to their sectarian creeds. But now that new horizons are being opened up, the call to re-think the position of the proselytising missions of Church officialdom becomes more urgent. A thinking Christianity in India has become a pressing problem. India—psychologically and in the conscience of the civilised world already free—will be recognised as such by the British Government by June 1948. Will the Christian churches be free by then ?

The denationalisation process that has undermined humanity in the Indian Church is so great an evil that it outweighs all the educational or literary advantages the country has derived from the white missionaries. Leaving aside the living and Oriental Christ, they preached to us the mechanism of the church officialdom, a Christ clad in swaddling-clothes or imprisoned within steel dogmatic walls. The missionaries denationalised us all; demoralised many and deadened creative enterprise among the poor fish caught within their net. The people of the Khasia Hills are today neither Indians nor the jovial, simple hill tribes that they were prior to the missionary trade in that blooming part of Assam. In India throughout, all those Christians who follow the leadership of the official Churches of the West, are cut off from the nationalist forces on the one side, and from the redeeming grace of the Oriental Christ on the other. The bigger the Church, the greater its power to grind down originality and spontaneity of thought and action.

All that is worth while and really useful in the Western churches has already been accepted and embraced by representative Indians like Ram Mohun Roy, Gandhi and Tagore. We have accepted what is worth while in the religions of the West, not because of, but in spite of, the Christian missionaries. The official bureaucrats of the Churches are far removed from the heart and soul of the Christ of Palestine and the cultural heritage of India; they also stand poles apart from the Gospel of "Jesus and Him crucified." How many among the missionaries can say with Jesus: "The foxes have holes and the birds of the air have nests, but the Son of Man hath not where to lay his head"? How many among them have had that living experience of God in Christ, of Christ in God, which St. Paul and other early missionaries experienced ? How few missionaries can say, "Follow me; I am a follower of Christ"!

The Indian Christian community is cut off from the taproot and therefore from natural growth. The Indian Christian groups are like branches cut off from the Vine of Life, which will wither away in time. They claim superiority above their own countrymen and their exotic scriptures are raised above those sources of the *philosophia perennis*,

which have formed what is best in the lives of representative Indians. This indictment is not limited to the missionaries' neglect of our Vedas and Vedanta alone, but covers almost the whole range of social, moral and political life as well. This denationalisation can hardly be compatible with the demand for the nationalisation of foreign elements in this Awakened India.

With the exception of so few missionaries that they can be counted on the tips of the fingers, neither the white missionaries nor their brown acolytes have really understood the spirit of India's cultural heritage. Sadder still is the fact that they have not understood the eternal message of Jesus of Nazareth, whose God-realisation made him great with a sort of divine kinship. The ecclesiastical officialdom is tied with the vested interests, with much of political bargaining and diplomatic manœuvring, a condition which will have to end if Christianity is to give a lead and light to benighted humanity.

Wiser brains both in the East and in the West have made suggestions along these lines that alone will really bridge the gulf between East and West. But the officialdom of the Churches has failed to heed this warning. They are suffocating; no daring leadership has ever come from Church officialdom. It is the thinkers and mystics that have given vitality to the Church and have brought the message of the Gospel to the world at large. The history of so-called heresies is the history of individual adventurers and solitary martyrs who have sacrificed their life in quest of creative truth, which all great prophets have realised in themselves and proclaimed to the world as the saving gospel and the redeeming message. The "Gnostic heresy" was nothing but *Jnana marga* in Western garb. The "Arian Heresy" was nothing but monotheism and stern asceticism reintroduced into the polytheistic and self-indulging official Church. The Roman Church has branded Luther as the arch-heretic, Luther, a valiant fighter for human freedom against the machine-minds of the ecclesiastical profiteers. The papal theologians defined the modernist thought in the Catholic Church as the "compendium of all heresies." Yet for one acquainted with the comparative study of religions and philosophies, men like Alfred Loisy and George Tyrrell were the most catholic minds within the Roman Church, citizens of the world on the same level as a Vivekananda or a Rabindranath in India. Even with the keys of the kingdom the Roman Church cannot shut the gates of immortality or shut out perennial inspiration from the hearts of those who have had direct experience of God.

Do I then advocate a clean sweep of Christianity in India? Not a clean sweep, but complete adaptation and integration. The Christian West today needs missionaries more than India, China or Japan, who

have more spiritual resources to redress their past and to build up their future. Although we inveigh against the ignorance and the superiority-complex of the Christian missionaries, we still can pray that they may be forgiven for having built up the city of Cæsar in the name of the City of God. Those churches that grew in India as a by-product of British imperialism will have to quit their privileged position with the quitting British. The mighty ecclesiastical bureaucrats must tumble from their thrones. Let those who would remain adapt themselves to the national needs and adopt India as their country.

Wiser brains in this, as in every other century, have pointed out the way to wed the East with the West. The missions have discarded that way. Christian missions will grow freely only in so far as they understand this irresistible urge to unity and the changed outlook in India and the world.

Will Christian missions continue to proselytise in a free India? The answer is clear. There can be only free Christianity in a free India. All the exotic plants will slowly but surely die out. The Church of England will better thrive in England than in India. The Church of Rome will be relegated to Rome and an Indian Church, truly national but with an international significance, be formed. In centuries gone by the missionaries have enticed many "natives" with offerings of Western dress and teaching them a little English. The trading with religion must end in India with the ending of British rule.

The time has come for Indian leadership in everything concerning the vital problems of the Indian people, whether the citizens of new India are labelled Hindus, Moslems or Christians. The changing of labels, called conversion, will have no meaning in a free India and an enlightened world. Only the deepening of racial, national and human consciousness is needed. Then a Catholic from Italy, an Anglican from England and a Lutheran from Germany will join hands with their soul-mates from Hindu India, Moslem Arabia, Shintoist Japan or Confucianist China. Differences and quarrels are only on the surface. On deeper levels all religions meet. Mutual help in realising the common God of all through the way best suited to each will be welcomed. But mere re-labelling and denationalising of Indians by Western missionaries and their Indian clerks will be resented and resisted by a free and responsible national government of India.

The Indian genius is essentially free and, loyal to our religious traditions, we can hardly brook religious authority from outside. The official Christian churches are essentially based on the authority of either Bible or tradition or both. The Indian religious genius is creative, whereas the official Christian churches are mechanical, authoritarian and spirit-stifling. It is for this reason that most representative

Indians have shown disinclination towards proselytism. When the Foreign Government goes, the foreign capital of the missionaries also will greatly weaken, which will affect the churches' pomp and show. With them much of the aggressive superiority-complex also will fade away. The official churches have only bad omens from everywhere even before the quitting of the British. How much more when representative Indians will be entrusted with the task of running their country, of preserving what is lasting in their national heritage and of enhancing and integrating it with what is lasting and worth while in all civilisations! So, missionary activity in its official sense will prove uncongenial and un-Indian in a politically and economically free India, in a spiritually and morally awakened India, however welcome in a spiritually regenerative and redemptive sense, in a way compatible with the Indian genius and Indian self-respect.

ANTHONY ELENJIMITTAM

COLOUR PREJUDICE

That practice must be squared with profession if the latter is to carry any weight is brought out by Frank S. Loescher in *Pathways to Understanding: Overcoming Community Barriers to International Cultural Co-operation* (Pamphlet 15, The Edward W. Hazen Foundation, Haddam, Connecticut). Race attitudes in the United States are of world importance today, when international understanding is so essential, and the crowding of foreign students to America's shores offers a golden opportunity for promoting it.

That American racial practices and the tendency to think of other peoples as inferior are directly opposed to the basic ideal of American life must be admitted. As Mr. Loescher writes, "the dichotomy between the American creed and the American deed cannot be hidden."

White Americans sooner or later will find out that people of colour are a majority of the world's population and that the United States cannot go on perpetuating anachronistic customs and at the same time try to sell democracy to the world.

Mr. Loescher urges frank admission of "our national sin." Its recognition as such must precede effective American participation in the "gradually developing world effort to eliminate discrimination based on race, colour or creed." That effort will not be served by creedal-prejudice-ridden India's or ideology-bound Europe's taking a "holier-than-thou" attitude towards the weakness of our American brothers. It is for the men and women of all countries to declare an all-out war on prejudice of every stripe.

HOLLAND'S CONTRIBUTION TO EUROPEAN CULTURE

[How much the poorer culturally the world would be without the contribution of the smaller nations is brought out again in this article by **Arnold D. Lissauer**, who since the war has served as London correspondent of a group of Dutch newspapers and as the editor of a weekly which started underground during the last war. He shows again, as has been previously shown in our pages in articles on Hungary, Belgium and Switzerland, that quantity and quality are quite independent factors. The world, bemused and overawed by size and numbers, will do well to substitute the criterion of cultural achievement in assessing worth.—ED.]

Dutchmen often humbly apologise to foreigners that their country is only very small. That is indeed the case, when we refer to its geographical size and its nine million inhabitants. They are, however, wrong when they mean by the word "only" that from abroad the Dutch nation is looked upon with a certain degree of pity, because of its physical smallness.

The world has heard much of the Dutch achievements—the never-ending struggle against the water—the dikes and bridges, the reclaiming of the *Zuiderzee*—Holland's in so many respects magnificent work in the overseas territories and finally its fight against the unbearable German occupation.

But the Dutch are not merely a people of technicians, merchants or soldiers. They are religiously, spiritually and culturally a highly educated people, many of whom know three or four foreign languages. The country's smallness was, after all, an advantage for the individual development of the people. The Dutch never knew the adoration of force, displayed throughout history by the big nations. They fortunately never became a militaristic power, although their navy conquered many overseas areas on behalf of a flourishing Dutch trade. But the fighting was not the main concern of the Hollanders, because it was always counterbalanced by a peaceful spirit of constructiveness.

So Holland became one of the most modern and progressive nations in the world and its way of life was and still is an example and an inspiration for others.

Its geographical situation between Germany, England and France and its flatness meant an invitation to the outside world, not for conquest, because its rivers and waterways were, even in the last war, as difficult to overcome as the Alps (!), but for a positive human intercourse. In the same way as the large rivers, the Rhine and the Maas, carried their fertile silt to Holland's shores, the

minds of its population were constantly stimulated by the ideas which prevailed over the frontiers. By this productive confrontation Dutch culture and philosophy got a unique opportunity to develop and they found their way all over the world.

This explains that, although Holland is "only" a small country, its contribution to European and world culture is amazingly large. Culture never exists *in vacuo*. It is always interlocked with economic and social activities.

Leaving aside the older times, in which there was a living unity between the greater part of the European peoples under the Church of Rome, and turning to the most important period of the Renaissance, the actual beginning of the modern conception of life and of the national differentiation, the Dutch character was challenged to the utmost degree by the Spanish invasion in the sixteenth century. The eighty years' struggle against Philip of Spain, whose great-grandmother, Mary of Burgundy, because of her marriage to Maximilian of Hapsburg, had brought the Low Countries—now the separate kingdoms of Belgium and Holland—under his crown, made the Dutch love freedom more than ever. The new religion, Calvinism, which came into shape in the same period, was another factor which promoted the consciousness of their own individuality, although it restricted by its contempt of all earthly things the development of culture, or tried to do so. The revolt against the Spanish invaders and their terror was successful in the Northern half of the country, which became an independent state.

The main feature of the Dutch way of thinking was the dignity of the human individual and this is the basis of the Netherlands culture with its spirit of freedom and independence. Moreover, Holland became the classical asylum for all those who were persecuted elsewhere, such as the Spanish, Polish and German Jews, the French Huguenots and the Flemish Protestants. Among them were many great scholars and spiritual leaders such as John Locke, Descartes and Spinoza. Books, which at one time were forbidden in other countries, were printed in Amsterdam and other centres. The great Dutch humanist Erasmus, a close friend of Sir Thomas More, was the product of Dutch tolerance. His ideas about world peace influenced the whole of Europe and they are still of high importance in our day.

In the period following the Spanish war Holland was, it may be said without exaggeration, the very centre of European culture and civilisation. Its language was even understood far beyond the Dutch borders.

The world still owes its gratitude to the famous Hugo Grotius, the founder of international law. A new relationship was growing in international affairs. Foreign countries were no longer exclusively considered as potential enemies, but as

members of the world family. His importance may not be underestimated, because they who understand the course of history are convinced that his ideals will be translated into reality in the years to come.

Holland's "Golden Century," as the seventeenth is called, was a most exceptional period of wealth and culture such as hardly any other country has known. Enormous amounts of gold and silver poured into the Dutch territory as a result of its world trade. At the same time we see a tremendous development in cultural achievements. This clearly demonstrates that always a certain degree of economic welfare happens to be a condition for the flourishing of cultural life. Artists got orders by the hundreds. Never has there been another time in Western Europe that people enjoyed life so much. After the slumbering Middle Ages they awoke and discovered a new world of bright colours, of human beings, of the beauty of Nature, of wide seas and exotic lands. Science discovered the laws of Nature, the planets, the stars. Whoever mentions Dutch culture always first thinks of the art of painting, for which the Dutch seemed to have a special ability. The works of the Dutch Masters, with their own character, belong to the treasures of mankind. It was Holland's bright colours and atmospheric condition, with the wonderful effects of sunlight, that especially invited pictorial expression.

The self-conscious citizens of the wealthy merchant and intellectual class not only wanted to have their portraits painted or to enjoy pictured scenes from daily life and of Nature, but also sought objects and paintings, furniture and other forms of applied art for investing their capital. The cultural standard of a people always can be judged from its objects of use and so it must be admitted that the Dutch, also in modern times, have a very highly developed culture.

In the age of the Renaissance men had turned away from the merely religious concentration of mediæval times. And it seems that there were hardly enough means to express their heightened feelings.

The art of painting in Holland dates from the Middle Ages, when frescos were made on the church walls, but as a result of the damp climate most of these have disappeared. The art of glass painting played an even more important rôle, as was the case with the weaving of tapestries. Famous was the painting of book miniatures, which preceded those on cloth.

In the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries Dutch painters were invited to the French courts. In that period the Dutch paintings already showed their own character. The Dutch painters were more realistic than their contemporaries. They already made use of a certain degree of perspective and displayed a fine contrast between light and shadow. Huibert and Jan van Eyck are re-

garded as the founders of the Dutch art of painting, but it is difficult to separate the Northern and Southern art of those days. The Northern paintings show a more exact reproduction of the landscape and their colours are brighter than those of the South.

In the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries the most important centres of painting were Amsterdam, Leiden and Haarlem. Many painters from the South went to Holland as a result of the Spanish War.

Rembrandt Harmenszoon van Rijn, often regarded as the greatest Dutchman of all time, was a painter of superb genius. His way of expression, especially the contrasts between dark and light, the golden light, his approach to the soul of men, is up till now incomparable. The way in which the painters of those days created this deep and moving atmosphere is lost. Their technique, apart from their creative power, was a monopoly of the seventeenth-century masters, who were able to express the dynamic element in the art of painting. Rembrandt's paintings, etchings and drawings are of monumental dramatic greatness.

Other famous masters were Franz Hals, Jan Steen and Johannes Vermeer. The last in his pictures of home life reached Rembrandt's level. Jacob van Ruysdael was the greatest painter of landscapes of all time. The art of painting of the Golden Century still exercises its influence as a source of inspiration. One of the greatest masters of modern times is Vincent van Gogh (died 1890), who together, with the French painters Cézanne and Gauguin brought new life into the European art of painting. There are still numerous painters in Holland. Among them is Queen Wilhelmina herself.

As important as painting was the art of wood-carving as displayed in the most beautiful church interiors. As regards pottery we only have to remember the Delft-blue ceramics still being produced.

Calvinism unfortunately was in many respects a drawback to the magnificent cultural development of those times, because it frowned upon the graven image. Because of it also music declined from its seventeenth-century greatness. Many Protestants were opposed to the use of organs in church ceremonies. The greatest Dutch composer, the father of organists, Jan Sweelinck, preceded the rise of Calvinism. Music flourished in the beginning of the fifteenth century, when Dutch musicians gave performances far abroad. Dutch choirs even went to Rome and Florence. The most famous composers of those days were Dufay, Ockeghem, Obrecht and Josquin. Many of their works influenced even the highly developed Italian music. Several times new techniques were introduced by Dutch musicians and it is said that they invented counterpoint. It is funny to notice that in some churches organ playing was only allowed after the service in order to keep the people out of the pubs! House music, as the paint-

ings show us, was practised to a large extent. In modern times, Holland with the famous Amsterdam Concertgebouw Orchestra and its former conductor Willem Mengelberg, who became a world celebrity, is a centre of music again. Composers such as Bernard Zweers and Alphons Diepenbrock are well-known abroad.

One of the most important of the modern sculptors was the late J. Mendes da Costa.

The other cultural achievements of modern Holland are still impressive. Among them architecture, as also the design of technical constructions such as river bridges and modern factories, takes a high rank. Many modern architects found their inspiration in the old art of Egypt, Persia, Babylonia and Assyria. The Amsterdam Bourse by the most famous modern Dutch architect Dr. H. P. Berlage opened a new era. Other modern architects are Dr. P. J. H. Cuypers, the creator of the National Museum in Amsterdam and the Central Station in that city, K. P. C. de Bazel and M. de Klerk. W. M. Dudok is the builder of the famous Hilversum Town Hall. They all make use of bricks, which are a product of the Dutch soil.

The city of Amsterdam is a real open-air museum of old and new architecture. A great achievement was the building of beautiful workers' quarters, which are among the finest of Europe. Fortunately Amsterdam was hardly affected by the war. Its seventeenth- and eighteenth-century merchant palaces along the tree-shadowed canals are irreplaceable. So are the seventeenth-century Town Hall, which now serves as a Royal Palace—the Queen's residence is in the Hague—and the numerous clock towers, all built by famous architects. In all small towns of Holland you find the traces of the former prosperity in the form of nicely shaped façades, weigh-houses, warehouses, gates and churches. The Gothic cathedral in Bois-le-Duc ('s Hertogenbosch) is a monument of fantastic richness of details. The magnificent Renaissance Town Hall of Middelburg was seriously damaged in the war. Holland's bridges are in many cases also the work of architects and belong to its cultural assets.

Dutch literature forms also an important aspect of the arts but, owing to its language, is limited to Holland, Belgium, the Indies and South Africa, although many books have been translated into English, French and German, and some into Russian and Spanish.

Two writers have had an influence throughout Europe and beyond, namely, Multatuli (Eduard Douwes Dekker was his real name), who in the second half of the nineteenth century introduced a new way of writing and was the first to protest against the Dutch colonial régime in the East Indies; and the great religious-socialist woman writer Henriette Roland Holst, who at seventy-six still takes an active part in the contemporary spiritual and political life of Holland. Henriette

Roland Holst, poet and essayist, belongs to the circle of "Friends of India." With Gandhi she believes that Western civilisation ought to understand the life and thoughts of India, because it needs so much the spiritual values of the East.

Troelstra, the founder of Socialism in Holland, was a Frisian poet.

In the "Golden Century" the scientific development was as tremendous as the cultural one. Boerhaave was such a famous physician that it was sufficient to put on a letter: "Boerhaave, Europe."

The period counted many inventors and discoverers of the first order. Zacharias Jansen invented the microscope, Hans Lippershey the telescope, Anton van Leeuwenhoek discovered bacteria, infusoria, blood corpuscles and sperms. Christiaan Huygens was the inventor of the pendulum clock and Simon Stevin invented a sailing carriage, discovered the parallelogram of forces and found practical use for the decimals.

Holland produced several outstanding theologians who displayed an original mind, such as Geert Groote (fourteenth century), Wessel Gansfort (fifteenth century), Adriaan Florisz, who became Pope (fifteenth-sixteenth centuries) and tried to improve the Roman Catholic Church, and Menno Simons (sixteenth century), the founder of the Anabaptist church.

Philosophers numbered only a few, such as Geulincx (seventeenth-century, rationalism) Hemsterhuis (eighteenth century, the so-called enlightenment philosophy), Van Hemert and Kinker (nineteenth-century, Kant), van Heusde (Plato) and J. van Vloten (Spinozism).

Among modern thinkers of unusual greatness and influence were P. J. Bolland (Hegel) and Tj. de Boer, an international authority in the field of Arab thought. H. J. Pos connected the phenomenologist philosophy with the science of languages. Others are G. Heymans, the creator of psycho-monism and his brilliant pupil Leo Polak, who was murdered by the Nazis.

During the German occupation not less than 200,000 men, women and children, half of them of Jewish origin, were massacred. Among them was a high percentage of eminent scholars and artists, who played such a significant rôle in the resistance movement. This loss can never be made good.

Other scholars of world fame are the Nobel Prize winners Lorentz, Zeeman, Van der Waals, Kamerlingh Onnes (all in Physics), Van't Hoff and Debije (Chemistry), Einthoven and Eikman (Medicine) the latter being the discoverer of the anti-beriberi vitamine. The lawyer Asser won the Nobel Peace Prize. The great botanist Hugo de Vries (died 1935) originated the mutation theory.

Summarising, one is entitled to say that Holland's contribution to European culture and world thought is of the utmost importance, especially when the country's smallness is taken into account. Throughout

the world the voice of the Netherlands is heard. It always appeals to constructiveness, common-sense, freedom and peace, without which Dutch culture as an indivisible part of Holland's life cannot exist.

ARNOLD D. LISSAUER

THE WHY OF THINGS

When a scientist asserts that "the why of things is the cardinal scientific problem," as C. Judson Herrick, Professor Emeritus of Neurology of the University of Chicago, does in "Seeing and Believing" in the March *Scientific Monthly*, he has turned towards metaphysics. He pronounces both traditional idealism and traditional materialism scientifically untenable, holding that the validity and the primacy of neither subjective nor objective experience should be denied.

Not only, he believes, are all vital activities directed towards some end, but even in the inorganic realm "there seems to be an end to be achieved and an orderly process directed toward that end."

> The meaning of any natural thing or event cannot be fully grasped or explained scientifically until we discover its relations to the other components of the orderly flow of process that we call our cosmos.

Cosmic events taking a spiral course, discoverable directive trends make prediction possible. He sees the task of science as being to discover the laws of the natural order and "to show how to adjust our human affairs in accordance with them." What he calls "the mechanism of this apparent teleology" he maintains

> is intrinsic to the natural system in operation; it is not imposed upon it from without. This is what we mean by saying that it is natural, not a mystic thaumaturgy.

If by "mystic thaumaturgy" he means some miraculous performance, or external intervention, every thinking man will agree, though some might quarrel with his choice of terms. But a mechanistic explanation is ruled out by his admission of inward impulses for external acts. "Every purposeful act," he writes, "is motivated and directed by affective and rational mental acts." Surely if, as he says, "all natural processes are interrelated in an integral orderly system" analogy requires that the visible cosmos must be similarly worked and guided from within without.

To ask "the why of things" is ultimately to seek the source of the primary impulse of the evolutionary process and the informing, ever-present moving-power and life-principle taught by archaic science. For it is only metaphysics, embracing psychic and spiritual nature as well as physical within its ken, which can make modern science an integral whole.

I MEET ANANDA K. COOMARASWAMY

THE TWENTY-SECOND OF AUGUST

[**S. Chandrasekhar's** article is most appropriate for publication in this issue, for the great savant celebrates his seventieth birthday on the 22nd of August. His views on numerous topics such as Pakistan and Maharajas, Gandhiji and Nehru, Indian students in the U.S.A. and American Indologists, ancient castes and modern progress will be read with more than ordinary interest. We salute this great son of Mother India and wish him the joy of a true contemplative after his return to this country.—ED.]

A BIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

Dr. Coomaraswamy, who is well known here, in Europe and in India only in scholarly and learned circles, has consistently shunned publicity and the American craze for personal exhibitionism. Though he has been living and writing in the United States for the last thirty years, he is not as well known as any cheap politician—Indian or American—who may champion the cause of India, or as the author of an average best seller, because Dr. Coomaraswamy speaks and writes with such care, precision and scholarship that his utterances are like terse mathematical formulas, far beyond the comprehension of even the intelligent lay reader, not to speak of the uninformed but articulate politician. And even those scholars that know about him or have read his writings know very little about his career or his background. Yet some knowledge of his background is necessary for the understanding of his thought. Most students of Coomaraswamy's writings may not know that his middle name is Kentish and that his mother was British. Ananda Kentish Coomaraswamy was born seventy years ago this month in Colombo, the son of Sir Muthu Coomaraswamy, the first Hindu barrister and a scholar in English, Pali and Sanskrit. Unfortunately Sir Muthu died before his son was two years old and the young Ananda was brought up in England by his British mother. He received his education first at Wycliffe College at Stonehouse in Gloucestershire and later at the University of London from which institution he obtained the degree of Doctor of Science in Geology. At twenty-two he began contributing articles to learned periodicals and at twenty-five he was appointed Director of the Mineralogical Survey of Ceylon.

It was while working in Ceylon that he discovered the tragedy of the imposition of Western culture and "civilization" on Oriental life, arts and crafts. Since then Coomaraswamy has described, defended and championed the cause of Oriental arts and crafts which were fast disappearing in the face of Occidental, machine-made, mass-produced cheap manufactures.

From 1905 to 1917 Dr. Coomaraswamy travelled extensively both in Europe and the Orient, observing and

studying the tragic results of the inevitable impact of twin cultures. When in 1917 he was appointed Research Fellow in Indian, Iranian and Mohammadan Art at the Boston Museum of Fine Arts, Dr. Coomaraswamy had already become well known as an outstanding scholar in studies pertaining to a dozen fields and countries ranging from ancient Greece and India down to the human problems of modern Asia and Europe. Since 1917, Dr. Coomaraswamy has written and lectured, expounding all that is truest, noblest and best in the world's great religions, philosophies and arts. He is the author of more than sixty books and monographs.

On reaching Boston, I telephoned the Museum of Fine Arts for Dr. Coomaraswamy, but was told that he had not come to the Museum that day because of a slight indisposition. On phoning him at his residence, he said he was sorry that he was not feeling well, but was kind enough to suggest that we go for a drive and have a discussion in his car, if I promised "to ask no biographical details," for Coomaraswamy is one of the most modest of men.

I had met Coomaraswamy once before when he delivered a most learned lecture at the New York Metropolitan Museum of Art to an admiring but lost audience, but on seeing him again I was reimpressed by his slim and stately figure of six feet two inches, his crop of flowing white hair, clear olive complexion, prominent nose and short grey beard —a combination of Mahatma Gandhi and Bernard Shaw. While Mrs. Coomaraswamy (Doña Louisa Coomaraswamy), his brilliant Argentine wife, who is a linguist and a scholar in her own right, sat at the wheel, Dr. Coomaraswamy and I discussed various things.

As that morning's newspapers were full of Pakistan—it was a few days before Mountbatten announced the plan for partition—I asked Dr. Coomaraswamy what he thought of it. "I suppose partition is inevitable," he said. "Perhaps it would be better if India were divided into a number of independent states or entities for the present, if a sufficient number of subjects were reserved for the Central Government. As for a corridor between Eastern and Western Pakistan, it is simply fantastic and impossible. Looking at our Moslem problem objectively I must say that Moslem grievances are not legitimate. It is largely a British creation and we have become ready victims. Partition is a step backward, though we may not be able to avoid it now. To me the whole tragedy is that Jinnah is not a real Moslem. Were he a real Moslem he would recall the past centuries when the Hindus and Moslems lived together peacefully and the times of Dara Shukho. Were Jinnah a cultured Moslem and not a Western-educated Mussalman, he would not clamour for this vivisec-

tion. Look at Maulana Abul Kalam Azad. He is a real Moslem and well versed in the Moslem spiritual heritage and a scholar of world renown. He has no quarrel with the Hindus.

"The Hindu-Moslem question is a political problem. It is not a religious problem; it seems so only to the superficial Americans. Jinnah is a Moslem only in name. The Hindu-Moslem problem is a cultural problem only in the sense that Indian Moslems are not educated as are the Persian Moslems."

I asked Dr. Coomarswamy whether after partition the Moslems might not return to a united India, having discovered that Pakistan was no real answer for grievances—real or imaginary. "Perhaps," he replied, "if somebody like Azad, who understands Islam, can lead the Moslems, there may be a possibility of a unified India. Even Jinnah might find that the economics of Pakistan is simply suicidal. Pakistan or no Pakistan, I hope they make the archæological survey of the present Government of India a kind of a central subject, undisturbed by these plans for partition."

"What about the Princes?" I wanted to know.

"I am not against the Princes." Dr. Coomaraswamy was emphatic. "Ask them to live up to our traditional *Rajadharma*. It is true that we have only a few Indian Princes living up to the classical ideals of monarchy, like the late Maharaja of Mysore. My plan would be to let the Indian Princes rule, so long as they behave themselves, judged by the canons of Indian rulership. And if they don't come up to the mark, why, just throw them overboard. The trouble with the Indian Princes today is that they do not know their responsibilities, because they are not educated in their own culture. Once the British leave they will not have to pretend to be Anglo-Indians. If they behave as true Hindus or Moslems they can establish successful and popular administrations."

We then discussed the recent piece of legislation of the Madras Government permitting Harijans to enter Hindu temples. Dr. Coomaraswamy was in favour of the legislation, though he added that nobody in India understood the real and classical significance and objectives of the Hindu caste system.

"If anybody understood this institution he would know that *every Hindu is born casteless*. And a man can be a Brahmin only if he has proved himself to be one. According to this definition, I wonder whether there are many Brahmins left in India. Caste is not to be based on birth—was never intended to be so, —for if one becomes a trader he must be called a Vaishya. I would like to see, not the abolition of caste, but the intensification of caste in this direction. In this sense, only the discoverer of truth, the creative artist and the teacher can be Brahmins, and not the Brahmin cooks, the Brahmin clerks, and all the other so-called born Brahmins." If I under-

stood Dr. Coomaraswamy aright, he stands for the abolition of caste *as it is today*.

He deplored the abolition of the departments of philosophy and humanistic studies in Indian colleges and universities, as well as the great importance given of late to technological studies. He said he was shocked to find that not even ten per cent. of the Indian students coming to the United States on Government of India scholarships were pursuing cultural and humanistic studies. "Every student seems to be studying chemical engineering. I suppose they will make India a storehouse of explosives!"

"I have met several Indian students," he continued, "but they seem to bring nothing to this country, not an iota of Indian culture. They are ignorant of their own country's heritage. They wake up only after coming here and then they learn it is too late to learn or understand their own culture. How can these students understand India? They are like unorganised barbarians, coming to the United States trying to learn the American trick, which is beneath contempt. *I am against the concept of raising the standard of living* endlessly. There will never be a possibility of contentment. Life is larger than bath tubs, radios and refrigerators. I am afraid *the higher the standard of living, the lower the culture*. Why, more than fifty per cent. of Americans have never bought a book in their life-time and the Americans have the highest standard of living in the world! Literacy is not education and education is not culture."

I asked Dr. Coomaraswamy whether he was against raising India's percentage of literacy.

He drew my attention to his recently published book, *Am I My Brother's Keeper?* in which he has dealt with this subject on pages 21, 27, 31 and 32.

We next discussed the profound ignorance of even fairly educated Americans about Indian affairs, not to speak of the abysmal ignorance of the average American. I asked Dr. Coomaraswamy what he thought of the handful of American scholars who teach Sanskrit or head departments of Oriental studies in certain large American universities. To be specific, I asked him what he thought of American scholars like William Norman Brown of the University of Pennsylvania, J. C. Archer of Yale University and others at Harvard, Columbia and California. "They are all able scholars," Coomaraswamy admitted, "but American Indologists are only philologists, and to them Indic studies are not a living experience. For an American to teach Sanskrit, or to do research in Indic studies, may show a love for quaint things or, what is even worse, be just a calling. *What this country needs is a department of Oriental studies in every college and university, staffed by scholars to whom Oriental studies are a living experience and not just an academic discipline.*"

I asked him what he thought of

the need for a cultural *attaché* in all of our embassies and consulates, now that we are organising for the first time the Indian Foreign Service and opening embassies and consular offices in the major countries of the world.

"It is very important," Dr. Coomaraswamy replied. "Like France and other countries, we need a cultural *attaché* in every embassy, and the men who are sent for this work ought to be men who are Indians, first and last, and yet capable of being citizens of the world. I hope Pandit Nehru does not overlook this."

Speaking of Pandit Nehru, he observed, "Nehru is the man of the hour and of the moment, because we have been caught unawares and unprepared, and he speaks a language that the West understands; Gandhi, despite all his errors, is the man of the age—our age. Gandhi is great because he has dared to speak of non-violence in a time of violence, of peace and brotherhood in a time of degradation and human destruction. He has spoken of man's highest inner quality, and though we, who are of limited vision, cannot expect to follow him, we cannot refrain from admiring and even worshipping him—a man who is showing us a way which cannot perhaps be followed until mankind is tamed. We in the West want Gandhi's India and no other. Don't think that by imitating us in the West, monkey do as monkey see, you are doing anything but monkey tricks. The greatest tribute I can pay the Mahatma is that he is *the only unpurchasable man in the world.*"

Lack of space prevents me from recording completely here even a few of the views and expositions of Dr. Coomaraswamy on various subjects. But I must mention that he thinks very highly of Nandalal Bose, Jamini Roy, Baba Herur, and Stella Kramrisch, in the realm of Indian art. He paid a glowing tribute to Stella Kramrisch's recent monumental study of *The Hindu Temple*. It is difficult to do justice to Coomaraswamy's views on art in this brief article, for he has written about art, not just Oriental art, in the last four decades with such mastery and understanding. He expounds the traditional philosophy of art as exemplified in the traditional arts and crafts from the classical Oriental and medieval European times. "What is the purpose of art?" one might ask. His answer is simple. "Effective communication, as ever." "But what can works of art communicate?" "Let us tell the painful truth," retorts Coomaraswamy, "that most of these works are about God, whom nowadays we never mention in polite society!"

Our discussion turned briefly to music and Dr. Coomaraswamy was glad to be assured that the harmonium is coming into disrepute in India. He said, "Apart from its being the least musical instrument, it also has the misfortune of being an alien-manufactured and Indian-imported commodity." Dr. Coomara-

swamy continued, "The veena and the thambur are not only instruments of good musical standing, but are also of Indian manufacture. If India would regain her soul she must go back to her classical art, music, handicrafts and dance, above all to her sages and her scriptures. We need more Radhakrishnans, Bharatan Kumarappas and Das Guptas, men who can understand and expound the spirit and culture of ancient India."

Regarding the problems raised by the contact between East and West, Dr. Coomaraswamy has a great deal to say. On that point too he has fully expressed his views in his recent publication, *Am I My Brother's Keeper?* on page 66, *et seq.*

In a word, the British attitude towards India has been like their attitude toward the Irish, "appointing British schoolmasters who knew no Irish to teach pupils who knew no English." In other words, at best, the whole attitude of the West toward the East has been, "We are both serving the same God, you in your way, I in His."

As we drove back to Dr. Coomraswamy's country residence in Needham, Massachusetts, he told me he would be retiring next year from the Museum and that he was planning to return to India after an absence of thirty years, to settle down and to enter into what he called his "vanaprastha and sanyasa ashramas." I asked him where he was likely to settle. "Perhaps at the foot of the Himalayas or in Tibet; some spot where I shall be least accessible."

I asked the Doctor whether, after having lived thirty years in Boston, accustomed to all the myriad comforts and conveniences of the American way of life, he would not find life in the Himalayas difficult? He answered, "These comforts are beneath contempt! Look at this house. I don't have a radio because I can't stand one. The longer I have lived in the United States the more Indian I have become, and therefore I shall be happy when I settle down in India."

As Mrs. Coomaraswamy showed me the Doctor's large, well-furnished, book-littered study upstairs, I noticed that his library contained books in some dozen languages. Mrs. Coomaraswamy explained that the Doctor worked every day, including Sundays, from seven in the morning until ten in the evening, permitting himself very little relaxation.

In the midst of innumerable paintings, sculptures, bronzes, books and manuscripts, almost hidden away, were two typewriters. Pointing to them, Mrs. Coomaraswamy explained, "That is the Doctor's, and this is mine." I saw a pile of typed manuscript next to her machine and Mrs. Coomaraswamy added that she was completing a large book on the history of Indian thought, which she hoped to finish before she accompanied her husband to India.

As I went downstairs to bid Dr. Coomaraswamy good-bye and thank him for sparing me his time, he asked whether I had studied Plato's *Republic* and Marco Pallis's *Peaks and Lamas*. I said I had read the *Republic* but not *Peaks and Lamas*. He showed me a copy of the book and described it as "one of those very rare books which it is almost impossible to overpraise." And as for Plato's *Republic* he advised, "Read it again."

Mrs. Coomaraswamy further explained the Doctor's views with a zeal and understanding befitting an ardent disciple, as she drove me to the station where I was to catch the train back to New York.

S. CHANDRASEKHAR

FREEDOM OF THE PRESS

That thirteen disinterested men of standing should indict the press for failure to meet society's needs should carry more weight than charges brought by individual critics; and they leave no doubt of their conviction that "the preservation of democracy and perhaps of civilisation may now depend upon a free and responsible press." Mr. Kenneth Stewart, analysing in *The Saturday Review of Literature* of 5th April the report of the Commission on Freedom of the Press, recently published in the U.S.A., finds it disappointing in that it diagnoses without prescribing adequate remedies. The Commission charges the press with failure to accept its full responsibility and to provide an open forum for diverse views, and also with obscuring the normal and the significant by emphasising the novel and the sensational.

The American press is largely in the hands of gigantic business units and its monopolistic structure is recognised as a greater menace to its freedom than Government regulation, though the Commission recommends the repeal of legislation against revolutionary expressions that do not incite to violence. Mr. Stewart is dissatisfied with the Commission's having dealt so largely in generalities. They have found personal forces at work to monopolise men's minds, but "do not point the finger," though a conspicuous example, Mr. Stewart shows, is offered by the "increasingly evangelical tone" of *Time*, in spite of its purporting to be a strictly factual record, offering no editorial opinion so labelled. In this connection, one of the Commission's most important and widely applicable findings is that "the identification of fact as fact and opinion as opinion and their separation as far as possible" are as important as reportorial accuracy.

> Much of what passes for public discussion is sales talk.... Sales talk should be plainly labelled as such; whether for toothpastes or tariffs, cosmetics or cosmic reforms....

It should be recognised as an unethical journalistic practice to smuggle propaganda past the reader's defences disguised as an uncoloured statement of fact. The misleading caption should have no better standing than misstatements.

Here in India we are witnessing the press passing into the hands of money-making business men. The Swadeshi Government now at work should watch this unhealthy development if it does not want to become a paw of big capital's cat.

NEW BOOKS AND OLD

A GREAT INDIAN POET *

No literature worth the name can ever develop on sound lines without being purified in the fire of criticism. Disinterested evaluation of a poet alone can grant him a long lease of life. Some of us, lovers of Oriental literature, are so intolerant that we cannot tolerate any views different from ours. We attribute all sorts of motives to the critic even when his criticism is balanced and fair. Dr. Sinha has the generosity to state that " above all this book is a plea for toleration of views. "

This point of view the readers of this book and the admirers of Iqbal should bear in mind and judge the book in the light of this noble ideal.

Since the demise of Muhammad Iqbal a large number of appreciative articles and books in both English and Urdu have been published but none of them is sufficiently critical and free from preconceived notions and religious predilections. Not one writer has tried to estimate Iqbal's literary, poetical and philosophical works critically and disinterestedly. Dr. Sinha, ex-Vice-Chancellor of the Patna University, a veteran journalist of about fifty years standing, a statesman and a scholar of vast learning and deep erudition, has devoted a good deal of his time, labour and energy to collecting all possible material regarding Dr. Iqbal's life and poetry, philosophical knowledge, religious tendencies, political views and, last but not least, his deep and abiding interest in Islam and its influence on the civilization of the world. The resourcefulness and vigilance with which he has managed to lay his hands on every article on, or obituary notice of, the poet, published either in India or in England, is marvellous.

He seems to have read and utilized almost all the books that have been published on Iqbal, in Urdu as in English. He has studied Iqbal's complete works in both Persian and Urdu critically and carefully. He has made use of them in a fair and frank manner. He has taken every possible care to furnish authentic proof for every statement he has made and for or against the position he has adopted in arguing and developing his theme. We do not know of another scholar and critic who has taken so much pains in presenting every possible point of view held in various quarters.

Dr. Sinha has made sufficient room for difference of opinion, which he is ever ready to welcome. In order to maintain his right to say frankly and fearlessly what he honestly thinks in regard to Dr. Iqbal and his message he has given us a scholarly and valuable book. It would serve as a model for researchers in the field of literature. It is a magnificent performance.

Having stated the right of every critic to express his opinion fearlessly, we presume Dr. Sinha would welcome some of the points of view which the

---

* *Iqbal : The Poet and His Message.* By *Sachchidananda Sinha.* (Ram Narain Lal, Allahabad. Rs. 8/-)

present reviewer considers it his duty to place before him and other readers.

Iqbal has a permanent place in Urdu literature. His poetry has a special appeal for one who knows Islamic history, religion and philosophy. Being a true and devout Muslim he did his best to awaken interest and pride in the higher teachings of Islam. His one aim was to unite the Muslims of the world. His desire was to consolidate the disintegrating elements in Islamic society and to inspire the Muslims to rise again as the prosperous and victorious people which they were at one time. He had a deep-seated conviction of the vitality of the teachings of Islam which, according to him, did not a little in elevating and civilizing semi-barbarous races and placing them among the first-rank people of the world.

Iqbal may not be acclaimed an Indian poet of the rank and prestige of Tagore and others ; he may not occupy an enviable position among the Persian poets of today and may not have influenced their trend of thought. This much is certain, however, that his inspiring poems have played no inconsiderable part in infusing in the mind of the rising generation of Muslims natural pride in their cultural and spiritual traditions. No Muslim who reads his poems intelligently can help being deeply impressed and inspired by them.

Iqbal's writings have done not a little in reviving the Islamic cultural tradition and filling the Muslim's mind with fervour and zeal for its ideal. This is no small service to a large number of people professing the Muslim faith. He had a definite message to convey to his co-religionists and to the world at large, which he did well in his own way.

Iqbal was not only a didactic poet but also an inspirational one. Assertive every daring thinker always is. So was Iqbal ; but he never was aggressive or polemic in his appeal. Maybe his sphere of influence was limited, and yet it was sufficiently far-reaching. There is not the least doubt that the Indian Muslims and almost all the Persian-speaking people were greatly impressed by his message. He had also the good of humanity at heart, as some of his poems reveal.

It is acknowledged by literary critics that he was richly endowed with poetic gifts; the flight of his thought was high, his diction pure and sublime, his boldness of conception and his imagery were original, fresh and charming; he really deserves to be placed in the first rank of Indian poets.

In many quarters Iqbal is admired as a philosopher also. It is true that he studied philosophy in Europe and was well-acquainted with Eastern and Western philosophical thought ; but he cannot be looked upon as a creative philosopher in the sense that he contributed anything substantially original. One cannot help agreeing with Dr. Sinha's criticism that Iqbal was tied down to the dogma of Islamic theology to such an extent that he could not encourage free-thought, or think out a problem independently. Iqbal looked upon Plato, in the words of Mr. Anwer Beg, as " the leader of the old herd of sheep, " and Mr. Surwar reminds us that the poet was a deadly foe of Platonism. If this was the fate of Greek philosophy at the hands of Iqbal, says Dr. Sinha, one is not likely to be surprised when told by Mr. Beg that the poet " equally depreciated Hindu and Buddhist philosophy. " That

may well be taken for granted, for is not philosophy the result of free-thought, and did not Iqbal declare in one of his poems that " freethinking is the invention of the Devil " ?

It may be added that no attempt should be made to prove Iqbal a philosopher-poet. He was essentially an Islamic poet who tried his utmost to emphasize the Islamic point of view and to spread the message of the true spirit of Islam to the Muslim world. One who has avowedly pinned his faith on any religious dogma cannot possibly indulge in free-thought and give expression to his views freely.

But Iqbal, like so many other poets, although professing the faith of Islam implicitly, was moved by the prevailing mood at different times when he gave expression to his poetical musings. If this changing mood be accepted as a psychological fact, one should not accuse Iqbal of holding divergent views and giving expression to contradictory theories. Occasionally he wrote poems which were patriotic, at other times he harped on pan-Islamic brotherhood and at yet other times his sobering reflections were revealed on humanism and universal idealism.

It is said that Iqbal should not have resorted to Persian and neglected the claim of Urdu as a vehicle of his poetic thought. It may be remembered that Iqbal's mother-tongue was Punjabi and that he learnt Urdu in the same way as he learnt Persian. As already stated, Iqbal had a definite mission in life and that was the resuscitation of true Islamic ideals, awakening the Muslim world to the recognition of its ancient glory and inspiring the Muslims to march forward in the name of God to attain worldly honour and prosperity. If he had confined himself to Urdu he would have appealed to a limited number of Muslims in India and his message would not have travelled beyond the borders of India. One of his main objects in adopting Persian as the medium of poetic expression was to appeal to a wider circle of Muslims and to convey his message to a large number of his co-religionists in different parts of Asia, Afghanistan, Iran, etc. Once he wrote to Sir Ali Imam, with whose help and encouragement he was able to publish his famous book *Asrar Khudi*, as to why he had taken to writing in Persian in preference to Urdu. The reason was that just stated.

Dr. Sinha has rightly pointed out that Iqbal was not in active sympathy with Islamic mysticism. As an admirer of Rumi he could not have disbelieved in the mystical lore of Islam but he ardently desired to revive Islamic virility in its pristine purity. One of the effects of mystical life is to dry up man's ambition for worldly progress and advancement; and if Iqbal had promulgated Islamic mysticism the Muslims of his day would not have been ready to muster their courage, to pool their resources and to be up and doing in the field of action.

Iqbal did not claim to know modern Persian as well as the Iranians do. He had no ambition in that direction. His Persian poems may not be up to the mark so far as the idiom and diction of modern Persian are concerned. But it cannot be denied that he had a good command over the classical Persian through which he made himself understood by all Persian-knowing people.

There are many other points in this book with which one does not agree; there are some with which one cannot

help agreeing. Enough has been said to show that there are certain aspects of Iqbal's teachings which should have been presented in a better light. What is given us in this learned thesis is enough to show that Iqbal's poems and writings are not above criticism and that they should be studied with an open and unbiassed mind. Dr. Sinha's services to this aspect of literature cannot be sufficiently praised. It is an exemplary literary effort which needs emulation. We heartily felicitate him on the accomplishment of this great task.

M. HAFIZ SYED

Hinduism and Modern Science. By M. A. KAMATH. (The Author, Planters' Lane, Mangalore. Rs. 4/8).

Muslim Contribution to Science and Culture. By Mohammad Abdur Rahman Khan. (Muhammad Ashraf, Kashmiri Bazar, Lahore. Re. 1/8)

In the tense atmosphere prevailing in the country it is good for one's mental balance to pause and consider what the other community has done for fostering the common culture. These two books, by authors who are not well known, draw our attention to what the ancient Hindus and Muslims contributed to the common pool of human knowledge. Dr. Kamath looks at the origin and development of Hindu civilisation through the eyes of a medical practitioner. He discusses Hindu social organisation, daily practices, religious ideals and rituals, yogic discipline and the conception of final liberation, with enthusiasm rather than with critical insight. Quotations from original sources are given in an abundance out of proportion to the expository and evaluatory parts of the book. We may not agree with the author in his whole-hearted approval of certain social institutions, for instance, the caste system. We welcome, however, his modest attempt to broadcast the Hindu spirit of tolerance, catholicity and universality.

> The Hindu has never burnt any heretic, in fact he has never looked upon anyone as a heretic. His land has been the land of Freedom for all religions.... A Hindu will readily part with a piece of land for the building of a mosque or a church as he thinks that man must grow by his Dharma.

These words need incessant repetition at the present moment. The author of the second book has taken pains to ferret out the "Arab" sources of medicine, mathematics, chemistry, biology, mechanics, history and philosophy. It is refreshing to find him acknowledging the indebtedness of the Arabs to the ancient Hindus in the realms of mathematics and astronomy. Sometimes extravagant claims are made, as, for instance, the claim that the Arabs were the first nation to use charts for maritime navigation! All told, however, this tiny monograph is sober in its presentation of Muslim claims to science and culture. But the author's vision is oriented towards the West, as he is all the while speaking of what the Arabs have contributed to the advancement of Western culture. This outlook is to be regretted because, had he presented the contribution of Muslims to Indian culture, he would have rendered a greater service at the present moment.

P. S. NAIDU

KAHLIL GIBRAN'S PHILOSOPHY *

The wisdom of the Ancients—of all countries and of all ages—is the proud common possession of mankind though unfortunately the modern man, panoplied in the glittering pride of his own superficial accomplishments and upstart pretensions, is often indifferent to the voice of ancient wisdom. But that voice asserts itself every now and then through some poet, philosopher or prophet, through men whom Carlyle characterizes as "the fire-pillars in this dark pilgrimage of mankind who stand as heavenly signs, ever-living witnesses of what has been, prophetic tokens of what may still be, the revealed, embodied possibilities of human nature." These hold aloft the burning torch of wisdom to help the mortal follow the path of light. To this noble band belongs Kahlil Gibran—though he is not so universally known and read as he deserves to be.

Kahlil Gibran (1883-1931) was born in Bsherri, Mount Lebanon. At a very early age he published several books and contributed prolifically to leading Arabic journals. Towards the close of his life, due to persecution at home, he settled in the U.S.A., and began writing in English. Soon these books and the English renderings of his Arabic writings were read by millions of eager men and women who hailed him as "the Dante of the twentieth century" and as the savant of the age. These two books are translations of Gibran's Arabic originals and are typical of his ripe wisdom and fearless expression.

Tears and Laughter was written when the author was scarcely twenty years old, and very appropriately does Gibran call it the "first breeze in the tempest of my life." It contains, couched in beautiful poetic prose, the musings of Gibran on some of the serious complexities of existence, such as Love, Fortune, Life, Death, Soul, and also philosophico-poetical reflections on rain, poets, waves, flowers. In all these is spread for the reader a rare feast of advanced thought, in the form of parables at times, and always simple and highly nutritious to the spirit. The keen metaphysical probing, the wise understanding of the intricate phenomena of life, and the tremendous philosophical significance exhibited by Gibran elicit our unstinted admiration. Who would not be set thinking when Gibran declares: "It is my fervent hope that my whole life on this earth will ever be tears and laughter"? He realises the value of both for he knows that they are naturally and inextricably intertwined in human life as well as in the life of flowers, waves and clouds. What is specially praiseworthy is the universal sweep of Gibran's mind, the lucid perception of his inner eye, and the delicate and allegoric wisdom of the ancients which seem to be his birthright.

Spirits Rebellious, first published nearly half a century ago, deals with three definite problems—of love and marriage (in "Madame Rose Hanie"), of social, legal and political injustice (in "The Cry of the Graves"), and

* *Tears and Laughter* and *Spirits Rebellious*. By KAHLIL GIBRAN, both translated from the Arabic by ANTHONY RIZCALLAH FERRIS and edited by MARTIN L. WOLF. (The Philosophical Library, Inc., 15 E. 40th St., New York City. $2.75 each)

of religious bigotry and priestly arrogance (in "Kahlil the Heretic"). On its first publication, the book created a sensation among state and church officials, and was publicly burned in the Beirut market-place. The book is a powerful cannon-shot aimed at the citadel of all types of tyranny and orthodoxy—social, legal, political, religious. In the name of tradition and conventions the worst types of offences are perpetrated by those in power against the ignorant and illiterate masses. And, when people like Madame Rose Hanie or Kahlil the Heretic stand upright to protest, they are misunderstood, misrepresented, maltreated and persecuted. Nevertheless, the spirit of such martyrs is unbroken, and they continue to hold the light for others. The three parables are a passionate plea of Gibran for the eradication of all meaningless customs, codes and conventions that stifle human freedom; for a recognition of the dignity and self-respect of the poor and the downtrodden; for the tempering of authority with love; and for the upholding of truth and justice at all costs and against all odds. And, indeed, the plea holds good even today.

Both these soul-stirring volumes are beautifully produced, and I would not hesitate to make the suggestion that The Philosophical Library of New York seriously consider the publication of a uniform edition of all Gibran's works. In doing so they will surely be rendering an inestimable service to aspiring humanity. For Kahlil Gibran is a writer who takes his stand with Socrates and Tagore, a sentinel at the outposts of human consciousness, one whose speech is song, whose wisdom is light, and whose word is revelation!

V. N. BHUSHAN

The Essence of Buddhism. By DAISETZ TEITARO SUZUKI. (The Buddhist Society, 106, Great Russell St., London, W. C. 1. 1*s.* 6*d.*)

Dr. Suzuki's Command Address to H. M. The Emperor of Japan on April 23rd and 24th, 1946, here translated by himself, is, Mr. Christmas Humphreys explains in the Preface, the first of several lectures by experts in their fields arranged "to provide the Emperor with information on various aspects of Japanese life with which his previously secluded position had made it difficult for him to become familiar." This is a most remarkable address. As clear as universal mysticism can be made to the intellect, it lifts a veil from that which lies within, above and beyond the reasoning mind.

Professor Suzuki shows the physical and spiritual worlds to be both real but interfused.

> The ocean of non-distinction expresses itself in the waves of distinction, and distinction is possible only in the ocean of non-distinction.

For him who awakens to the spiritual world of non-distinction, the world of multiplicities itself becomes the Pure Land. The spiritual man moves naturally, undisturbed by outward circumstances, self-forgetful, free. "...our own self is a self only to the extent that it disappears into all other selves." The Buddhist aims at self-perfection to be able to help others,

> and this is the essence of the great Compassion. Yet perfection in helpfulness is only reached when the helping has become un-

conscious. So long as one is conscious of helping others this very consciousness interferes with the flow of the great Compassion, and only when Compassion flows while drinking tea and walking in the street will even drinking tea and walking in the street be the actions of the great Buddha heart of the All-Compassionate One.

Lack of understanding of the Great Compassion, which flows from the Great Wisdom, and *vice versa*, is common to totalitarianism and individualism and may make even modern science "a misery to mankind":

...even democracy, of which we in Japan have lately heard so much, must, if it is to succeed, be founded upon it....

E. M. H.

The Double Image. By RAYNER HEPPENSTALL. (Secker and Warburg, Ltd., London. 8*s.* 6*d.*)

In this study of four contemporary French Roman Catholic writers Mr. Heppenstall describes himself as a "curious outsider." Such an angle of approach does not promise any particular intimacy but it has at least the negative advantage of ensuring to some extent against prejudice. Mr. Heppenstall is neither for nor against the faith of Roman Catholics. He is concerned only to reveal its literary effects in the work of three novelists and one playwright. The chief effect would seem to be an incitement to extremes. If liberal bourgeois culture drained human life of tragic reality, Catholicism, in these writers at least, preserved it with a large mixture of melodrama. Mr. Heppenstall writes of "the deformed genius of Bloy, the dreadful, turgid and effortful talent of Mauriac, the narrow violence, the lightning illumination, which is neither genius nor talent but atavistic clairvoyance, of Bernanos and, of Claudel, the talent with the amplitude of genius." The chapters which he devotes to each of them reinforce at length on the whole these descriptive summaries. But to what extent Bloy would have been obsessed with destitution-poverty or Mauriac with sin, or Bernanos with the idea of the scapegoat, whether they had been Catholics or not, it is impossible to say. Certainly their religion intensified these predispositions. Indeed Mr. Heppenstall believes that "within the pattern of Christianity, only sin, despair and heresy release the imagination." This is an overstatement. But a sincerely Christian novelist must obviously see human life as a redemptive mystery or even as a crucifixion in one way or another. He may, of course, as Mr. Heppenstall suggests, cultivate a secret doctrine in conflict with the official teaching. But if he is a Roman Catholic, it is likely to bear the outward stamp of authoritative dogma. And though intensity of a kind is gained by viewing life within a prescribed religious framework, the work of all these writers, with the possible exception of Claudel, reveals not only a certain creative bias, but often an unhealthy distortion. Imaginative truth easily declines into sensational extravagance in a writer who for any reason is prevented from combining the force of personal interest with a profound disinterestedness. This is certainly borne out by Mr. Heppenstall's account of these writers. He has not written, on his own admission, a profound or searching book and too much of it consists of summaries of plots. But it is often suggestive and pleasantly vivacious.

HUGH I'A. FAUSSET

Chapekar Commemoration Volume. (Marathi). (S. R. Tikekar, Secretary of the Chapekar Commemoration Committee, Saraswat Bank Bldg., Bombay 4. Rs. 6/-)

This volume in Marathi is in honour of Shri N. G. Chapekar on his completion of fifty-one years of devoted services to Marathi literature. Although Shri Chapekar has consistently written in Marathi, all his writings, which comprise some fifteen volumes on a variety of serious subjects ranging from economics to the study of a Hindu subcaste (the Chitpavan Brahmins) and from accounts of pilgrimages to a sociological study of life under the Peshwas, mark him out as a research scholar of great erudition and balanced views, in no way inferior to those who choose to present their studies in English. His *magnum opus* "My Village—Badlapur" (in Marathi) is a unique work in a modern Indian language, giving a complete picture of all the traditions and activities of all the communities in that village, complete with a systematic record of all the relevant facts and figures.

The volume contains papers by thirteen friends of Shri Chapekar. Though it is not possible to give even a brief account of these in such a short review, a few salient ones may be mentioned. Shri S. R. Tikekar's paper is a refreshing study of society in Kumaon in the United Provinces. After briefly alluding to its traditional history, in which Maharashtrians are reputed to have played some part, he gives information, gathered directly from the priests, of the feasts and festivals observed throughout the year by the Brahmins in Kumaon. One is surprised to note that some of the social customs, in that far-away tract bordering on the southern slopes of the Himalayas, closely resemble those current in the Maharashtra. Prof. D. D. Vadekar's learned paper on the Psychology of Personality shows incidentally how his Marathi equivalents for technical terms in Philosophy and Psychology can be successfully used without detriment to the treatment of the subject. Prof. K. P. Kulkarni's lengthy paper is mainly concerned with a somewhat detailed account of the methods of teaching in Ancient India, some of which bear comparison with those propounded by modern Western educationalists. Shri K. B. Gajendragadkar's paper points out how the Customary Law of the Hindus was, even in ancient days, liable to be modified from time to time with the changing conditions and for the good of society. Shri C. G. Karve's paper, based on original documents, gives glimpses of some social practices of the lower stratum of society and the judicial decisions thereon under the Peshwas.

The prefatory essay by Professor Vadekar is an eloquent and warm appreciation of the literary and social activities of Mr. Chapekar. While it gives an admirable portrayal of Mr. Chapekar the man as he appears to his admiring friends, Mr. Chapekar's own paper which closes the volume gives some inkling of the ideas and ideals that move the inner Chapekar. One wishes that it were more personal and less generalized.

The printing and get-up of the volume are quite pleasing.

N. A. GORE

Blake: A Psychological Study. By W. P. WITCUTT. (Hollis and Carter, London. 8*s.* 6*d.*)

The author has applied the key of Jungian psychology to unlock the door to Blake's symbology and, like other keys, it serves to reveal several correspondences but it will not serve for a satisfying interpretation of Blake. Jung, of course, admits of super- as well as sub-conscious levels to the human mind and the treatment of Blake from these two aspects by Mr. Witcutt is a thoroughly sympathetic study. He shows Blake to be a most valuable guide to one desirous of understanding his own states of consciousness. Mr. Witcutt remarks that Blake is the only one of the poets who has ventured far into the inner regions of the unconscious and yet remained sane, able to report what he had seen. Why did Blake return in peace from that *terra incognita* where so many stumble and fall? Maybe in the answer lies a clue to a deeper understanding of Blake in which his symbols would yield a meaning pertaining to the higher tetractis of man and not merely to his fourfold lower nature.

According to Mr. Witcutt's application of Jung's psychology, Blake's "Four Zoas" become merely the fourfold division of the "psyche" into intuition, thought, feeling and sensation, and their "Emanations" and "Spectres" simply aspects thereof. Surely this is to reduce the "Mighty Ones" to a fraction of themselves. These "Zoas" are to be found in all the great scriptures and refer to Universal Man, as well as to their correspondences in the human being. That the fall of man so-called does not take place till Night VII in *Vala* shows that the preceding visions of the separation of the Zoas had reference chiefly to spiritual and cosmic manifestations anterior to the appearance of dual-sexed humanity. As Blake shows, sex is only a terrestrial differentiation. To give spiritual reality to sex was to Blake the real Fall; in fact to speak of the psychology of sex is a misnomer and only shows how far the term has been degraded in its meaning. Real psychology should be the science of the soul, into which sex does not enter. The redemption according to Blake comes when life is seen with the Divine Imagination and spiritual identity free from sex is realised. This explains why Blake was able to live out his full and happy life in humility and simplicity, able to control his pride and lower nature because his fourfold vision, as he wrote his friend Butts, enabled him to see not merely past the physical objects but also past their images in the lower psychic world of supersensuous perception and to reach to the spiritual prototypes beyond.

J. O. M.

ENDS AND SAYINGS

"_____ends of verse
And sayings of philosophers."
HUDIBRAS

Since we last wrote on the 1st of June a very quick change has taken place in the political scene of this great country and the tragedy of "division" of the one truly indivisible has taken place. We agree with the view expressed by Sir S. Radhakrishnan in his speech at Madras on the 2nd of July.

> Anyway the partition is a fact and we have to approach it in a comradely spirit and make the best we can of the situation into which we have been led either by the weakness of the Congress, or by the intransigeance of the Muslim League, or by the subtlety of the British.

How is the comradely spirit to be manifested and what is implicit in making the best we can of the unfortunate situation created? The primary concern of those who can rise above political animus and ambitions and who take a moral view of history will be to refuse to be swayed by the partition and to continue to regard themselves as Indians whatever their domicile. In the Indian Union there are everywhere large numbers of Muslims as there are in Pakistan Hindus and others and we must continue to regard all as Indians.

We must try to remove from our minds and hearts the forces which create minority problems. Communalism has been allowed to do great mischief in the past and so has religious creedalism, which must, however, be exposed in its true colours and *called* a weapon for murder and bloodshed. Muslims and Hindus are of one race and blood and so are Indian Jews and Christians and Parsis; Sikhs like Jains also are of that race and blood. The culture of India has within it the heritage derived from the Turkish, Moghul, Iranian, Afghan and other comrades. Neither the Indian Congress nor the Muslim League nor the British Quitters can perform a miracle and take away from the blood, the mind and the heart of peoples their Indian-hood, however many be the dominions and "sthans" they or any one else may carve out. Our primary concern, therefore, should be to keep alive in our countrymen from Karachi to Calcutta and from Allahabad to Trivandrum, the intuition that they are sons and daughters of one Mother.

Has the non-violent and satyagrahic revolution started by Gandhiji in 1918 in this country failed? Has it contributed much or anything to the changes which are now taking place? At first sight it looks as if the Indian National Congress face to face with violence has failed. That Gandhiji was not fully supported by the Congress in his plan and policy of 29th May is an open secret; that in spite of the rejection of his methods and views Gandhiji has, so far, chosen to shepherd the Congress membership implies that he has still hopes of carrying with him in his non-violent way of life a fair-sized minority if not the vast majority of Congressmen. In the Indian Union the Moral Force of Culture, which

compels brotherhood *in actu*, must be given its full expression and Congressmen, Hindus, Muslims and others, must set an example in unity and solidarity among themselves. The rulers and administrators of the Indian Union must show in practical application the power of the Gandhian ideology, which is of supreme value not only for India but for the world at large. We doubt not that whatever happens Gandhiji will continue to carry forward the revolution of which he is the author and creator, and to support him in that task is to undo the evil of vivisection. Let political and economic planning be inspired, guided and executed by Moral considerations and Soul principles.

We write this on the American Day of Independence. The Promoters of the Revolution of 1776 did their work for their own country and for Humanity. A profounder revolution, not in Indian but in World history has been taking place and it must continue its motion till we have once again our country, a united whole, crowned by the Himalayas and washed by the waters which meet at Cape Comorin, part of the One World from which war has vanished and in which prosperity, born of peace, abides.

4th July, 1947.

At the first meeting of the Senate of the newly-started Sind University, held June last, at Karachi, Professor Haleem, the Vice-Chancellor, observed rightly in the course of his speech (*The Daily Gazette*, 25th June):—

> A complete divorce between secular and religious learning has affected adversely our national character and even the development of Muslim and Hindu culture. It is high time to rectify this error and to frame courses (of studies) which would enable Muslims and Hindus, as well as members of the other communities, to be conversant with the great teachings of the faiths they profess. Studies of this kind, it may well be hoped, will tend to develop more harmonious personalities than our seats of learning have been producing for some time past and to diminish that extreme individualism which has become the bane of modern society.

Indeed, the glaring omission of real unsectarian instruction in the curricula of our schools and colleges has all along tended to make the students egocentric and ambitious and thus deprived them of an opportunity to cultivate the virtues of compassion and charity. And the sad results of this mistaken policy of our educationists are only too painfully evident in the present-day schisms and sectionalisms which have brought about the most regrettable division of modern India. However, even now it is not too late to bridge the gulf between the worldly and the spiritual, in our lives as in our labours, by stressing the truth of all life's being one in more than one sense. But particular care will have to be exercised in framing the courses for instruction in Religion so that the points of common agreement among the various faiths, and not the differences, which are usually superficial, are emphasised and integrated in the minds of the young. In this way alone will the latter begin to perceive the underlying unity of mankind and, collaterally, to develop a spirit of mutual affection and esteem, best expressed in acts of altruistic service.

"Other civilisations were destroyed by barbarians from without. We breed our own." Thus Chancellor Robert M. Hutchins of Chicago University in

Peace Aims Pamphlet 41 (National Peace Council, London). In *The Atom Bomb and Education* he describes the new barbarians, many of them sharp-witted, technically skilled, even learned in specific disciplines, but lacking that "mastery of a system of ideas" which is culture, having "no conception of the nature of the world or the destiny of man" because isolated by private preconceptions and fractional views.

"The motto of contemporary economic life is 'Get all you can.'" Instead of combating this doctrine, fatal to world government which "can live and last only if it institutionalises the brotherhood of man," contemporary education denies the value of comprehension of the whole and offers special techniques that confer advantage in the struggle with fellow-men.

The "fundamental problems of our time are philosophical," but the prestige of philosophical studies is declining. A truly liberal education ought, among other things, Mr. Hutchins suggests, to impart understanding of "the ideas and ideals which have animated mankind"; ability to distinguish between good and bad, true and false, beautiful and ugly; knowledge of the ends of life and the purposes of organised society; and training "to become a member of a community which shall embrace all men." Integration, unification, synthesis, order and intelligibility, these are among the aims.

He tests the relevance of education by its potential contribution to the necessary world change in the minds and hearts of men, the "moral, intellectual, and spiritual revolution" which, if civilisation is to be saved, has to "match the scientific, technological, and economic revolution in which we are now living."

> To try to get all we can, to breed more barbarians, to regard one another as so many animals, rational or not, will lead us inevitably to the final catastrophe.

But the revolution he demands "is necessary, and therefore possible."

There are many examples of the intimate fusion of West and East in the medieval medical field, thanks greatly to the Moslems, declares Leonardo Olschki in "Medical Matters in Marco Polo's Description of the World," a reprint from the *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* (Supplement 3, 1944) which reached us recently. There was Orientalism in medical literature before Marco Polo's travels in the late thirteenth century. From antiquity, most of the "superstitions" about herbs, drugs and balms as well as stones, minerals and gems had been of Oriental origin.

Marco Polo, a layman writing for laymen, gives "only indiscriminate and occasional details about curative methods and superstitions" in the East, where, as in medieval Europe, medicine was an occult science. He deals more with China than with India. He describes accurately the symptoms of sufferers from the goitre still prevalent in Chinese Turkestan and astutely ascribes it to "some quality in their drinking water."

In South India he observed a custom stimulating to the salivary glands and supposed "to be very good for the health," though followed mainly for the pleasure "of gratifying a certain habit and desire."

People there continually chew a certain leaf called *Tembul* which the lords and gentlefolks have prepared with camphor and other aromatic spices, and also mixed with quicklime.

He ascribed the Brahmans' "capital teeth" to the chewing of that invigorating herb, and their alleged longevity not to the fabled "elixir of life," which he also mentions, but quite simply "to their extreme abstinence in eating."

He mentions also "a stuff called *Tamarindi*," as in use as a purgative by "the pirates of Gozurat," described as a kingdom on the West Coast of India.

He lists many drugs and where they are produced and exported, without describing their medicinal properties, but sometimes connects them with attractive stories.

The East has valuable medical lore today, handed down from ancient times. Some of it has already found its way into Occidental practice. We have no doubt far more of it will do so when a more open-minded attitude prevails among the orthodox medical profession of the West and especially of India.

Dr. Bharatan Kumarappa, a member of a prominent Indian Christian family, recently issued a strong appeal to the Hindus to return to the Universalism of the Upanishads as the only way to unity and brotherhood in India. In *Bharat Jyoti* of 15th June he reminds his countrymen that not all the blame for India's disunity can be laid at Britain's door. Both major communities too readily fell victims to the Government's divisive policy. India's traditional genius for tolerance and assimilation was betrayed in the interest of narrow sectarianism. Dr. Kumarappa sees the Muslims' demand for a separate land as the reaction to the caste Hindus' shrinking from contact with them.

In such exclusiveness is the seed of discontent and disruption which the political opportunist can use for his own ends. So long as the seed remains, the plant can be grown with a little nurturing.

In the philosophy of the Upanishads there is no room for invidious distinctions between man and man, because all are recognised as embodying the Ultimate Reality.

If only this had been kept in mind by the nation through its long history, India would have been the greatest force for peace and reconciliation in the world.

But caste, as the rigid hereditary frame it has become, is a divisive force. "We cannot cling to caste and yet clamour for the unity of India." Happily it is not yet too late to revolutionise "canons of conduct and bring them in line with the Universalism of the Upanishads."